

**Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program  
Federal Fiscal Year 2019 Application**

**PROGRAM NARRATIVE**

**Description of the Issue**

In 2019, the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) continues its local JAG project grant development process for the upcoming next JAG cycle. The next cycle is to begin on October 1, 2019 and end on September 30, 2022, subject to BJA awards. On September 12, 2019, the award recommendations developed by the Board's Executive Steering Committee, which wrote the Request for Proposals and scored the applications, will be presented to the Board for approval.

The grant development timeline started on September 22, 2017 when the Board authorized the formation of a JAG Executive Steering Committee (ESC), led by the Board Chair to 1) develop the state strategy, 2) develop the RFP, and 3) rate proposals and make award recommendations to the Board.

On January 26, 2018 the JAG ESC met to develop the state strategy and RFP. During the meeting the ESC heard presentations from current JAG grantees and reviewed the JAG 2013 Stakeholder Survey Executive Summary and other background materials. The ESC determined that not enough time had passed to warrant a new assessment of the State Strategy and that the strategy is still responsive. The ESC recommended maintaining the current program purpose areas and Request for Proposal policies that were used in last grant cycle, including the California Department of Justice award ("less-than-\$10,000" award). The ESC further recommended using the same competitive funding formulas for small, medium and large counties, with \$2,000,000 set aside for Los Angeles county. Applicants must be counties, which are required to apply for equal amounts in each of the three years up to the cap, with a caveat that awards are subject to JAG awards to California for FFYs 17, 18 and 19. Counties must use the community engagement model to establish a JAG Steering Committee with a balance of stakeholders that will:

- Guide the implementation and monitoring of the JAG program within its jurisdiction.
- Work together to collectively identify the community's needs, develop a strategy, prioritize funding and identify measurable outcomes.

Applicants must set aside grant funds for data collection and evaluation efforts to complete a Final Local Evaluation Report. The purpose of the Final Local Evaluation Report is to determine whether the overall project (including each individual component) was effective in meeting the goals laid out in the Local Evaluation Plan. To do this, the

grantee must assess and document the effectiveness of the activities that were implemented within each individual project component.

Applicants were asked to focus on the following three basic principles of Evidence Based Principles:

1. Is there evidence or data to suggest that the intervention or strategy is likely to work, (i.e., produce a desired benefit
2. Once an intervention or strategy is selected, will you be able to demonstrate that it is being carried out as intended?
3. Is there a plan to collect evidence or data that will allow for an evaluation of whether the intervention or strategy worked?

Applicants were encouraged to develop an overall project that incorporates these principles but is tailored to fit the needs of the communities they serve. Innovation and creativity were encouraged as California's State Strategy states that "some emphasis shall be given to innovative and/or promising strategies to reduce crime and recidivism."

These ESC recommendations were approved by the Board on November 8, 2018 but the RFP (and the Request for Application from the California Department of Justice) were not immediately released pending litigation and award acceptances.

The RFP was released on December 6, 2018 and proposals were due by April 25, 2019. The BSCC received 31 proposals. Between April 26, 2019 and May 7, 2019, BSCC staff conducted a technical review of the applicant proposals. On May 14, 2019, rater training was given to the ESC members to ensure rater reliability during the reading and rating process. The ESC will score proposals according to the requirements of the Request for Proposals. This ensures that recommendations conform to federal and Board requirements and requests.

Below is the timeline of key dates remaining:

### Key Dates

| Activity  | Tentative Timeline |
|---|--------------------|
| Development of JAG funding recommendations        | July 24-25, 2019   |
| ESC Funding Recommendation Presented to the Board | September 12, 2019 |
| Local JAG Projects Begin                          | October 1, 2019    |
| New Grantee Orientation (mandatory)               | November 7, 2019   |
| Local Evaluation Plan due to BSCC                 | December 30, 2019  |
| End of the Grant Cycle                            | September 30, 2022 |
| Final Local Evaluation Report Due to BSCC         | December 31, 2022  |

These new competitively awarded projects reflect California's approved State Strategy and fund its three program purpose areas which are:

- a. Education and Prevention
- b. Law Enforcement
- c. Prosecution, Courts and Defense

California's prior local JAG grant cycle ended on either December 30, 2017 or December 30, 2018, depending on whether the local project accepted a one-year no-cost extension. This extension was offered after approval by the Board and BJA's approval of an extension to the Board's prior JAG awards

BSCC is cognizant of the enactment of the Justice for All Act of 2016 and the related changes that will be part of the 2019 JAG application. On September 12, 2019, the Board will be updated on the required timeline for the annual review process and plans for completing the next five-year State Strategy, tentatively planned to begin in October 2022. In preparation for this, BSCC anticipates working with the National Criminal Justice Association (NCJA) to gather stakeholder feedback before developing a new State Strategy. In the summer of 2019, California will begin a new State Strategy development process. Pursuant to the April 24, 2019, email from the BJA Deputy Director, BSCC will be submitting a placeholder 2019 budget in the amount of one dollar.

### **California State Strategy and History**

In March 2013, as part of the state's planning process for its JAG allocation, BSCC staff began working with NCJA to develop a stakeholder engagement strategy for the state strategic plan. As part of this engagement strategy, BSCC sought input from traditional and non-traditional criminal justice partners from across the state. This was accomplished through a survey and listening sessions. The listening sessions allowed stakeholders throughout the state to voice their opinions as to how JAG funding should be spent.

NCJA and BSCC staff developed a 14-question survey, which was distributed beginning April 1, 2013 to criminal justice stakeholder groups through an independent website, multiple listservs, and individual email messages. The survey closed on April 30, 2013, with 890 responses from around the state and across multiple elements of the criminal justice community, including Law Enforcement, Administration, Probation, Community Based Organizations, Victim Assistance, Juvenile Justice, Prosecution, Defense, Corrections, Mental Health, Education, Social Services, Courts, Substance Abuse Treatment, Public Health and Private Citizens.

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.

Respondents' top-ranked initiatives were those that addressed issues that impact multiple system partners. For example, gang prevention initiatives were the highest-ranked priority within the Prevention and Education purpose area. These initiatives address a problem that impacts law enforcement, juvenile justice, the courts, education, and social services. Likewise, problem-solving courts (e.g. mental health, veterans, drug, reentry), the top-ranked initiative within the Prosecution, Courts and Public Defense purpose area, address issues that impact multiple fields, (e.g., mental health, substance abuse, corrections, community corrections, public defense, prosecution and the courts). The survey results identified three Priority Purpose Areas and the top areas of need within each purpose area.

In preparation to develop the new State Strategy, the BSCC anticipates gathering new stakeholder input, including conducting statewide listening sessions and surveying juvenile and criminal justice stakeholders using NCJA's best practices model.

### Priority Purpose Areas

Below are California's current program purpose areas as recommended by the JAG stakeholders and approved by the Board:

| Top Three (3) JAG Program Purpose Areas | Top Areas of Need within each PPA   |
|---|---|
| <b>Prevention and Education</b>         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gang Initiatives</li> <li>• Juvenile Delinquency</li> <li>• Substance Abuse</li> <li>• School Violence</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Law Enforcement</b>                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gang Violence</li> <li>• Violent Crime Reduction</li> <li>• Drug Enforcement</li> <li>• Gun Violence Reduction</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Prosecution, Courts and Defense</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Problem Solving Courts</li> <li>• Gun/Gang Prosecution</li> <li>• Violent Crime Prosecution and Defense</li> <li>• Court-Based Restorative Justice Initiatives</li> <li>• Innovations in Indigent Defense</li> </ul> |

The survey results were reviewed by the BSCC Board and the following three-year strategy was developed and approved for the JAG Program in California.

### **Subrecipient Award Process**

#### **California Three-Year Strategy for the Byrne JAG Program**

- (1) The strategy will honor responses from the California stakeholders in the survey with priority given to the survey supported areas of:
  - a. Education and Prevention**
  - 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.**

The BSCC follows the State Strategy when selecting JAG program subrecipients. The selection of subrecipients is a competitive process for eligible jurisdictions. The RFP limits eligibility to the 58 California counties. Partnerships of two or more counties could be submitted as one joint proposal, though one county Agency was required to serve as lead on the proposal and be identified as Lead Agency in the application to the BSCC. The BSCC applies and will apply the following activities in awarding previous and new JAG funds:

**Analyze Statutory Requirements:** The BSCC begins each grant program by researching the subject area, analyzing the solicitation, statutory requirements, best practices and related legislative intent. This forms the basis of future steps and actions taken by the BSCC. The BSCC applies for funding to the BJA. The completed JAG application is posted for public viewing and comment for 30 days.

**Establish an Executive Steering Committee (ESC) to develop a State Strategy and Request for Proposal (RFP):** The BSCC appoints an ESC, chaired by a Board Member, to guide the grant process and provide recommendations on specific implementation procedures within the constructs of the JAG state strategy. This includes the development of a state strategy, recommendations on priorities, criteria, equitable competition, and distribution of funds, RFP, rating factors to evaluate project proposals, and effectiveness indicators to determine project success.

**BSCC Request for Proposals (RFP):** ESC recommendations are provided to the BSCC Board for action at a regularly scheduled meeting, and public comment is always provided. The BSCC Board may accept, change, or modify any ESC recommendations. The BSCC Board then approves the RFP, which is distributed to the public and posted on the BSCC's website.

**ESC Rates Proposals and Develops Funding Recommendations:** Each member of the ESC is assigned to evaluate applications and will independently review and score written proposals by applying the BSCC-approved rating factors included in the RFP. For each proposal, the cumulative scores on all rating factors will determine the applicant's rank in relationship to other projects.

**Award Grants:** The BSCC Board is provided with a rank-ordered list of proposed projects for funding at a regularly scheduled meeting, and public comment is provided. The BSCC Board may accept, change, or modify any ESC funding recommendations. The BSCC Board awards the subrecipient grants, and applicants are formally notified. Each project description and funding level is then posted on the BSCC's website.

### **Programs Eligible for Funding**

The BSCC limits the JAG grant funds to government programs designed within the State Strategy priority program purpose areas of Prevention and Education, Law Enforcement, and Prosecution, Courts and 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 2019 award will be provided to BJA at the completion of the BSCC subaward process. The "less-than-\$10,000" funds are awarded non-competitively to the California Department of Justice (CA DOJ), a state-level law enforcement agency, to support regional task force commanders.

## **Project Design and Implementation**

The BSCC uses a comprehensive approach for implementing the JAG program. The strategy is designed to incorporate stakeholders, both traditional and non-traditional, at the state and local level to ensure the program design fits the needs of the local jurisdictions. This approach includes strategic planning, community engagement, collaboration, stakeholder participation, and encouraging the leveraging of funds. The BSCC uses a monitoring and technical assistance program to ensure proper utilization of federal resources throughout the grant cycle.

### **National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) 3 Percent Set-Aside**

At the time of the release of the FFY 2019 Byrne JAG solicitation, California was not certified by the FBI that it was compliant 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. The monies allocated in the Byrne/JAG fund for NIBRS will be used to procure interactive software, laptops, management software, printer, training and NIBRS readiness assessments. Additional budgetary detail will follow once the JAG award is made.

### **California Strategic Planning Process**

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.

California has developed a three-year state strategy and priorities selected by criminal justice stakeholders throughout the state and approved by the BSCC Board. In March 2015, BSCC implemented the state strategy and the priorities through the projects at the local level. This program change was a major departure from the previous JAG program, in which 98 percent of JAG funding was placed in the law enforcement program purpose area for the creation of law enforcement task forces.

In addition, local subrecipients have been required to identify local issues/problems, plan, prioritize, collaborate and develop their own three-year strategy plan in one-year

increments. This process has led to traditional and non-traditional stakeholders being able to collaborate towards a common goal to reduce violent crime and recidivism.

### **Community Engagement**

Subrecipients must form a Local JAG Steering Committee comprised of stakeholders representing diverse disciplines who have experience and expertise in the proposed local interventions. The Local JAG Steering Committee will use a community-engagement model to determine the community needs and develop a three-year JAG strategy in one-year increments.

The Local JAG Steering Committee will represent a significant cross-section of juvenile and/or criminal justice stakeholders, depending on the intervention chosen, within the applicant county. The Local JAG Steering Committee composition will be diverse to include a balanced representation of both traditional and non-traditional 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. The county will determine the total number of members to serve on the Local JAG Steering Committee.

The Local Steering Committee will be an active participant in the development implantation, and oversight of the local JAG project.

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. The Local JAG Steering Committee will work collaboratively with the local communities to identify the needs of the community as they relate to the JAG priorities and to create and develop a comprehensive project plan with the overall goal of reducing violent crime and recidivism within their county.

- The Applicant must describe how it ensured full and equal participation and voting rights for all members of the Local JAG Steering Committee throughout this process.
- The Applicant must describe the process that took place to engage membership for the Local JAG Steering Committee, as well as any working relationships that existed with members prior to the development of the Local JAG Steering Committee
- The Applicant may use an existing group, or a subcommittee of an existing group, as its Local JAG Steering Committee but must address all requirements listed in this section.
- The Applicant must describe the expertise of each of the Local Steering Committee members and how he or she relate to the intervention being proposed in the submitted JAG application.



## Stakeholders Participating in Planning Process

As noted previously, the BSCC uses an Executive Steering Committee (ESC) to make recommendations on decisions related to the JAG programs. The JAG ESC is composed of subject-matter experts and stakeholders representing both the public and private sectors. The BSCC considers experience, geography, and demographics when considering ESC membership. The JAG ESC is tasked with providing recommendations to the BSCC Board regarding the state strategy, RFP, evaluations of the project proposals, and provide funding recommendations. The BSCC Board then approves, rejects, or revises those recommendations. Members of JAG ESC are not paid for their time but are reimbursed for travel expenses incurred to attend meetings. The BSCC approved the formation of the current JAG ESC. The members of the current JAG ESC are listed below:

### JAG Executive Steering Committee

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

## **Addressing Gaps in Resources**

The BSCC allows flexibility for the subrecipients to examine funding gaps and tailor the JAG projects to fund local project needs. Each jurisdiction examines funding gaps and designs a project plan that will fund the areas of need. Subrecipients of previous JAG funding have consistently 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 provided by county and community-based organizations (CBO's) as needed resources to implement effective programming.

## **Leveraging State 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.

## **Monitoring and Technical Assistance**

BSCC provides monitoring and technical assistance to ensure subrecipients understand and follow the JAG requirements and make progress towards the stated goals. BSCC provides technical assistance regarding fiscal, programmatic and administrative requirements, and special conditions.

### **Grantee Orientation**

Following the start of the grant period, BSCC staff conduct a mandatory Grantee Orientation to review the program requirements, special conditions, contract requirements, invoicing and budget modification processes, data collection and reporting requirements, and grant management and monitoring activities. Attendance is required by the subrecipient Project Director, Financial Officer, Day-to-Day Contact, the individual tasked with Data Collection and Evaluation and a minimum of one Community Partner.

### **Grant Administration Guide**

The BSCC Grant Administration Guide (Guide) is intended to help subrecipients comply with the terms and conditions that apply to JAG funded projects. The Guide can be accessed and downloaded by the subrecipients from the BSCC website at [www.bscc.ca.gov](http://www.bscc.ca.gov). Any forms referenced in the Guide are also available.

## **Monitoring and Technical Assistance**

Designated BSCC staff monitor each JAG subrecipient and provide technical assistance throughout development, implementation, and maintenance of the project. The goal of BSCC monitoring and technical assistance is to provide early intervention and resolution

of any issues that may arise during the term of the grant. Monitoring also helps ensure that projects meet stated goals and objectives, and desired outcomes.

The BSCC Field Representatives responsible for grant program development, administration and oversight have significant experience in the field of criminal justice and, at a minimum, must have three years of progressively responsible corrections or law enforcement supervisory, management, consultative or equivalent staff experience above first-line supervisory level in local corrections or probation agency or a state or federal corrections system. This experience must include at least two years in program development, program planning or research, program monitoring, staff workload, jail inspections, training or equivalent consultative experience.

### **Capabilities and Competencies**

Established in 2012, the BSCC is an independent statutory agency that provides leadership to the adult and juvenile criminal justice systems, a data and information clearinghouse, and technical assistance on a wide range of community corrections issues. (Pen. Code, §§ 6024-6025.) The BSCC is the designated State Administering Agency (SAA) for the state. In addition, the BSCC promulgates regulations for adult and juvenile detention facilities, conducts regular inspections of those facilities, and develops standards for the selection and training of local corrections and probation officers. When the BSCC was established, the administration of the Edward Byrne Memorial JAG grant program was transferred from the California Emergency Management Agency to the BSCC.

The BSCC also inspects for compliance to local correctional standards and directs funding for construction of local adult and juvenile detention facilities and ensures that the local jail projects meet recent Legislative mandates to provide program space to rehabilitate offenders.

The BSCC's work involves extensive collaboration with stakeholders, including, police chiefs, courts, local probation departments, sheriffs, county administrative offices, justice system partners, community-based organizations, and others. It is also the administering agency for a host of federal and state public safety grants, including evidence-based practices to reduce gang violence, and it works to reduce racial and ethnic disparities in the juvenile justice system.

Policy for the agency is set by the 13-member Board of State and Community Corrections, whose members are prescribed by statute, appointed by the Governor and the Legislature, and subject to approval by the state Senate. The Board Chair reports directly to the Governor.

## Board of State and Community Corrections Members

|    | <b>Designation per Statute</b>  | <b>Board Member (as of August 2018)</b>  |
|----|---|--|
| 1  | The Chair of the Board (a full-time paid position), appointed by the Governor.  | <b>Linda Penner, Chair</b><br>(former Chief Probation Officer, Fresno County)          |
| 2  | The Secretary of the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR).  | <b>Ralph Diaz</b><br>Secretary, CDCR   |
| 3  | The Director of the Division of Adult Parole Operations for CDCR.   | <b>Jerry Powers</b><br>Director, CDCR Division of Adult Parole Operations              |
| 4  | A county sheriff in charge of a local detention facility which has a BSCC rated capacity of 200 or less inmates, appointed by the Governor.   | <b>Dean Growdon</b><br>Sheriff, Lassen County  |
| 5  | A county sheriff in charge of a local detention facility which has a BSCC rated capacity of over 200 inmates, appointed by the Governor.  | <b>William Gore</b><br>Sheriff, San Diego County                                       |
| 6  | A county supervisor or county administrative officer. This member shall be appointed by the Governor.   | <b>Leticia Perez</b><br>County Supervisor of Kern County                               |
| 7  | A chief probation officer from a county with a population over 200,000, appointed by the Governor.  | <b>Mark Varela</b> Chief Probation Officer<br>Ventura County                           |
| 8  | A chief probation officer from a county with a population under 200,000, appointed by the Governor.   | <b>Michael Ertola</b><br>Chief Probation Officer<br>Nevada County                      |
| 9  | A judge appointed by the Judicial Council of California.  | <b>Gordon S. Baranco</b><br>Retired Judge, Alameda County                              |
| 10 | A chief of police, appointed by the Governor.   | <b>Andrew Mills</b><br>Chief of Police, City of Santa Cruz                             |
| 11 | A community provider of rehabilitative treatment or services for adult offenders, appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly.   | <b>Scott Budnick</b><br>Founder, Anti-Recidivism Coalition                             |
| 12 | A community provider or advocate with expertise in effective programs, policies, and treatment of at-risk youth and juvenile offenders, appointed by the Senate Committee on Rules. | <b>David Steinhart</b><br>Director, Commonweal Juvenile Justice Program                |
| 13 | A public member, appointed by the Governor.   | <b>Francine Tournour</b><br>Office of Public Safety Accountability, City of Sacramento |

The BSCC is further comprised of four Divisions, each of which plays an important role in monitoring and supporting the state's local corrections systems: (1) Corrections Planning and Grant Programs (CPGP), (2) Facilities Standards and Operations (FSO), (3) Standards and Training for Corrections (STC), and (4) County Facilities Construction (CFC).

The CPGP Division develops, administers, and evaluates state and federally funded grant programs to improve the effectiveness of state and local correctional systems, reduce costs, maximize resources and enhance public safety. As part of BSCC's responsibilities, the CPGP serves as a resource for evidence-based, effective, and promising programs, practices, and strategies; and provides technical assistance, consultation, and training to state and local justice system policy makers. Other federal grants administered by the BSCC include:

**Title II Formula Block Grant:** Supports delinquency prevention and juvenile justice system improvement.

**Residential Substance Abuse Treatment:** Assists states and local governments in developing and implementing substance-abuse treatment programs in state, local, and tribal correctional detention facilities.

### **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 Plan**

The purpose of the Local Evaluation Plan is to ensure that projects funded by the BSCC can be evaluated. Subrecipients will include a detailed description of how the applicant will assess the effectiveness of the proposed program in relationship to each of its goals and objectives. This relationship should be apparent in the Plan. 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.

### **Final Local Evaluation Report**

The purpose of the Final Local Evaluation Report is to determine whether the overall project (including each individual component) was effective in meeting the goals laid out in the Local Evaluation Plan. Subrecipients are required to assess and document the effectiveness of the activities that were implemented within each individual project component, as identified in Plan. The project evaluations are not research within the meaning of 28 C.F.R. § 46.102(d). The reports are intended to generate internal improvements to the program and to account for the projects' overall effectiveness.

DRAFT

Budget Summary

**Budget Summary**

*Note: Any errors detected on this page should be fixed on the corresponding Budget Detail tab.*

| Budget Category  | Year 1          |                     | Year 2<br>(if needed) |                     | Year 3<br>(if needed) |                     | Year 4<br>(if needed) |                     | Year 5<br>(if needed) |                     | Total(s) |
|--|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|----------|
|  | Federal Request | Non-Federal Request | Federal Request       | Non-Federal Request | Federal Request       | Non-Federal Request | Federal Request       | Non-Federal Request | Federal Request       | Non-Federal Request |          |
| A. Personnel   | \$1             | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$1      |
| B. Fringe Benefits   | \$1             | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$1      |
| C. Travel  | \$1             | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$1      |
| D. Equipment   | \$0             | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0      |
| E. Supplies  | \$1             | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$1      |
| F. Construction  | \$0             | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0      |
| G. Subawards (Subgrants)   | \$1             | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$1      |
| H. Procurement Contracts   | \$0             | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0      |
| I. Other   | \$1             | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$1      |
| <b>Total Direct Costs</b>  | \$6             | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$6      |
| J. Indirect Costs  | \$1             | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$1      |
| <b>Total Project Costs</b>   | \$7             | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$0                 | \$7      |
| Does this budget contain conference costs which is defined broadly to include meetings, retreats, seminars, symposia, and training activities? - Y/N |                 |                     |                       |                     |                       |                     |                       |                     |                       | No                  |          |