



2013 Byrne JAG Stakeholder Survey

A Survey of California Board of State and Community Corrections Stakeholders

Executive Summary

About the Survey

In March 2013, as part of the state's planning process for its federal Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) allocation, the California Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) began working with the National Criminal Justice Association (NCJA) to develop a stakeholder engagement strategy to inform the planning process in the development of the four-year strategy for the JAG program. As part of this engagement strategy, BSCC sought input from traditional and non-traditional partners across the state on:

1. past investments;
2. priority project types and initiatives within the seven JAG purpose areas; and,
3. priority purpose areas for funding.

Working with the NCJA, BSCC staff created a 14-question survey, which was distributed to BSCC stakeholder groups through the BSCC website, multiple listservs, and individual email messages beginning on April 1, 2013. The survey closed on April 30, 2013 with 890 responses from around the state and across all elements of the justice system.


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.

Findings


Priority Purpose Areas

While the majority of survey questions sought to drill down on initiatives within purpose areas, questions 2 and 3 were designed to address purpose area prioritization and funding distribution. Survey respondents from across the criminal justice system ranked Prevention and Education (JAG purpose area #3); Law Enforcement (#1); and Prosecution, Courts and Public Defense (#2) as their top three priorities. In addition, when asked how respondents would distribute funds, every element of the justice system spread funds across purpose areas with the aforementioned receiving (on average) higher percentages of JAG funding. The charts on the next page demonstrate how the respondents, overall, believed funds should be distributed and how the largest respondent group (Law Enforcement) believed funding should be distributed. The data also compares current 2012 California JAG spending with national distribution of state JAG spending.


All Respondents: How California JAG Should Be Distributed




Law Enforcement: How California JAG Should Be Distributed



2012 California JAG Spending



2012 SAA Byrne JAG Spending: National



Prioritized Purpose Areas and Top Ranked Initiatives

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.

While both of these priority initiatives are focused on reducing criminal justice system costs and preventing individuals from entering or further penetrating the criminal justice system, respondents also showed strong support for enforcement efforts that impact public safety. With almost universal support, Gang Violence and Violence Reduction initiatives were selected as the highest priority within the Law Enforcement purpose area.

1. Prevention and Education

With strong support from across the justice system, Prevention and Education was selected as a top priority. While responses to the specific question addressing this purpose area prioritized gang and juvenile delinquency prevention initiatives; respondents' top priorities across purpose areas demonstrated a clear desire for initiatives that keep people from entering, reentering or further penetrating

the criminal justice system. When asked how respondents would appropriate JAG funds across purpose areas, respondents from multiple fields (Courts, Juvenile Justice, Community Based Organizations, Education, Mental Health, Public Health and Social Services) indicated that the highest level of funding should go to the prevention and education purpose area. Effective gang and delinquency prevention initiatives not only positively impact public safety but save criminal justice systems money through reduction in crime, victimization, future incarceration, and involvement with law enforcement and court entities.

B-7 JAG 2013 STAKEHOLDER SURVEY, EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Law Enforcement

The second highest ranked purpose area was Law Enforcement, which received consistent support throughout the survey. Particular support for law enforcement was seen in the Administration and Policy, Corrections, Prosecution, Victims Assistance, Education and Social Service fields.

While the majority of stakeholder groups did not agree with drug interdiction as a top priority; respondent's prioritization of gang interdiction, violent crime reduction, gang prevention initiatives, and data collection and information sharing technology to support crime-fighting strategies (in other questions) showed clear support for law enforcement. The prioritization of Gang Violence and Violence Reduction Initiatives within the Law Enforcement purpose area show a clear preference for enforcement efforts aimed at improving public safety and holding violent offenders accountable. Effective violent crime and gang interdiction efforts not only improve perceptions of public safety, but also often have the effect of improving relationships between law enforcement and the communities they serve. It should be noted that improved relationships between communities and their law enforcement entities often lead to increased calls for service and increased reporting.

3. Prosecution, Courts and Public Defense

Within the Prosecution, Courts and Public Defense purpose area, there was universal support for problem solving courts. Nearly all respondent groups ranked problem solving courts as one of their top three priorities. Research has shown that effective problem solving courts will lower recidivism rates, improve offender accountability, improve perceptions of procedural fairness and save taxpayers money. Outside of problem solving courts, gang and violent crime prosecution also received strong support among traditional criminal justice stakeholders.

Moving Forward

While this survey serves as the bedrock for BSCC's stakeholder outreach strategy, survey findings are not meant to be a strategic plan. Strategic planning takes into account the knowledge held within the field, the decision making of appointed justice system leaders and a thorough review of available data to triangulate a strategy that addresses identified needs, gaps or emerging trends. While JAG funds represent only 3 percent of criminal justice spending nationally, these dollars represent an opportunity to fund initiatives that can positively impact the work of multiple system partners, enhance public safety, and if used effectively, will ultimately reduce justice system costs and save the taxpayers money. With that said, findings addressed here are meant to inform the Board of the knowledge, opinions, and consensus within the field.

Disclaimer This document was created with the support of Grant No. 2010-DB-BX-K086 awarded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance. The Bureau of Justice Assistance is a component of the Office of Justice Programs, which also includes the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the National Institute of Justice, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the SMART Office, and the Office for Victims of Crime. Points of view or opinions are those of the authors.

Primer and Methodology

B-7 JAG 2013 STAKEHOLDER SURVEY, EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In March 2013, as part of the state's planning process for its federal Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) allocation; the California Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) began working with the National Criminal Justice Association (NCJA) to develop a stakeholder engagement strategy to inform its four-year strategy and planning process. As part of this engagement strategy, BSCC elected to use a survey tool to help the organization receive input from both traditional and non-traditional partners across the state. In March, NCJA provided BSCC with examples of surveys used by other states and worked with staff to refine the survey instrument. In addition to NCJA and BSCC staff input, Board members provided feedback which was gathered and integrated into the final survey instrument. On April 1, 2013, the survey became accessible through the BSCC's website and was distributed to stakeholder groups through various e-mail distribution lists as well as individual e-mail messages. In addition, efforts were made to reach out to non-traditional stakeholder groups and associations. The survey closed on April 30, 2013 after collecting 890 responses from around the state and across all elements of the justice system.

Methodology

In an effort to reach as many stakeholders as possible and to solicit opinions from across the justice and service provider systems, BSCC chose to use a survey tool for its stakeholder engagement

strategy. The survey tool was placed on BSCC's website, and distributed to electronically to stakeholders including professional associations, for further distribution. While the use of snowball sampling¹ created an over representation of law enforcement within the respondent pool, it also allowed BSCC to solicit opinions from elements of the justice system that have not traditionally engaged in JAG multi-year strategy planning efforts.

Due to the over representation of particular elements of the justice system, results will not be displayed in aggregate, instead results will be provided by element of the justice system. This strategy should provide the Board and BSCC staff with a greater understanding of how different elements of state and local justice systems feel limited federal resources should be allocated.

While the survey was anonymous, a number of questions were placed at the beginning of the survey to allow for results to be categorized and analyzed along a number of dimensions. A selection of these questions are provided below for context.

- Please indicate the name of your county.

- What level of government do you serve?
- My role or the role of my agency in the criminal justice system is as follows (select only one category).


In addition to the above questions, respondents were asked questions pertaining to each of the seven JAG purpose areas and multiple questions aimed at prioritizing investment types. The survey also included a comments section which allowed respondents to expand on their answers.

Basic Survey Statistics

During the 30 days the survey was open, 890 of the 1,184 people who opened the survey completed it, for a 75 percent completion rate. While the majority of responses came in the first week, outreach efforts by BSCC staff during the final week of the survey substantially contributed to the addition of input from non-traditional stakeholders. Of the 890 respondents:

- 71 percent (633) were from local government
- 18 percent (162) were from state government

Number of Responses





- 11 percent (94) were non-governmental (non-profit/concerned citizens)
- .01 percent (1) was from tribal government

Respondents came from every county in the state except Alpine county with the highest number of respondents coming from the state's largest counties. In addition, of the 890 respondents, 46 percent or 414 respondents indicated that they either lived in or served a rural community.

Respondents

As mentioned earlier, the snowball sampling methodology utilized in the survey, resulted in an over representation of law enforcement, (this group not only represents the largest percentage of BSCC's listserv but also has historically received the largest share of California's JAG allocation). In an effort to present results in a more meaningful fashion; individual groups will be reported in groupings that take into account their place within the criminal justice system and how they responded to the survey. For the purposes of this report, along with the 422 responses from Law Enforcement, the collapsed respondent categories included the following number of responses:

- 77 - Corrections and Community Corrections (Parole/Probation)
- 73 - Courts (Prosecution, Courts, Public Defense)
- 98 - Social Service Providers (Community Based Organizations, Social Services, Substance Abuse, Mental Health, Public Health)
- 49 - Juvenile (Juvenile Justice and Education)



Question 1: Past Investments

B-7 JAG 2013 STAKEHOLDER SURVEY, EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

"In California, JAG funding is primarily used to support the efforts of state and local multijurisdictional drug enforcement task forces throughout the state, e.g., Anti-Drug Abuse, Crackdown Multi-Community Task Force, Marijuana Suppression, Campaign Against Marijuana Planting, Drug Endangered Children Training and Technical Assistance."

Question: Do you believe this the best use of this grant money?

Answer: Likert Scaling- Strongly Disagree- Strongly Agree

While support for law enforcement was strong throughout the survey, support for drug task forces saw its greatest support from the law enforcement community and the corrections (70 percent) and the prosecution (58 percent) subsets. Overall, state level law enforcement was more likely than their local counterparts to agree/strongly agree that drug task forces are the best use of limited JAG funds. When examining the written comments within the

law enforcement sub group it appeared that many respondents who disagreed or felt neutral about this subject (30 percent) believed that task forces efforts should be directed toward gangs, violent crime, and human trafficking efforts and away from activities like marijuana suppression. Similar comments were seen in non-law enforcement groups that both agreed and disagreed with the past use of JAG funds.

Outside of the support offered by traditional stakeholders in the enforcement community (law enforcement, prosecution, corrections) the majority of other respondents were either neutral or disagreed that drug task forces were the best use of limited JAG funds. The respondent categories who disagreed/strongly disagreed that drug task forces were the best use of money include: public defense (74 percent), community-based organizations (73 percent), juvenile justice (57 percent), citizen (54 percent), substance abuse treatment (50 percent) and courts (50 percent). When examining the comments from these groups, there was almost universal agreement that funds would be better spent on prevention, treatment, and diversion.

While overall support for the use of JAG funds to enhance law enforcement efforts had almost universal support across groups (see question 2 and 3); the data indicates that other elements of the justice system and even some within the law enforcement community felt drug interdiction was not the best use of limited JAG funds. Instead within this question and across the survey there was support for law enforcement to focus on violent crime and gang interdiction.

Question 2: Prioritizing Purpose Areas

Question: Of the seven JAG Program Purpose Areas listed below; rank in order of importance with 1 being the most important (7 being the least important), which areas reflect the best use of JAG funding for your community or for the state:

Possible Answers: Law Enforcement, Prosecution, Court, Defense, and Indigent Defense, Prevention and Education, Corrections and Community Corrections, Drug Treatment and Enforcement, Planning, Evaluation and Technology Improvement, Crime Victim and Witness Protection

While most respondents prioritized the purpose area they were most likely to receive funding under; the following three purpose areas received almost universal support. (1) Prevention and Education, (2) Law Enforcement and (3) Prosecution, Courts, Defense and Indigent Defense. All three were all listed in the top four priority areas for the majority of grouped and individual

Best Use of Money

	Agree	Disagree	Neutral
Law Enforcement	70%	18%	12%
Correction & Community Corrections	52%	22%	26%
Admin Policy	44%	36%	20%
Courts (Pros, Courts, PD)	30%	49%	20%
Victims	29%	34%	36%
Social Services (CBO, SS, SA, MH, PH)	22%	58%	19%
Education & JJ	18%	57%	24%

JAG Purpose Area Priorities

B-7 JAG 2013 STAKEHOLDER SURVEY, EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	Priority 1	Priority 2	Priority 3
Law Enforcement	Law Enforcement	Prosecution, Court, Defense, and Indigent Defense	Prevention and Education
Correction & Community Corrections	Corrections and Community Corrections	Law Enforcement	Prevention and Education
Admin Policy	Law Enforcement	Prosecution, Court, Defense, and Indigent Defense	Prevention and Education
Courts (Pros, Courts, PD)	Prosecution, Court, Defense, and Indigent Defense	Prevention and Education	Law Enforcement
Victims	Crime Victim and Witness Protection	Law Enforcement	Prosecution, Court, Defense, and Indigent Defense
Social Services (CBO, SS, SA, MH, PH)	Prevention and Education	Drug Treatment and Enforcement	Corrections and Community Corrections
Education & JJ	Prevention and Education	Prosecution, Court, Defense, and Indigent Defense	Drug Treatment and Enforcement

respondents. The Corrections and Community Corrections purpose area was most commonly listed as the fourth priority behind a combination of the aforementioned purpose areas.

The selection of Prevention and Education was the most universally agreed upon top priority and was consistent with responses to other survey questions and within the comments sections. While the specific question regarding this purpose area prioritized initiatives that provided prevention and education services around gang and juvenile delinquency; the top prioritization of problem solving courts, alternatives to incarceration, and children exposed to violence initiatives in response to subsequent survey questions is consistent with the idea of preventing individuals from entering or further penetrating the criminal justice system.

The selection of Law Enforcement as a top priority was consistent with

the support that this group received throughout the survey. While the majority of groups did not agree with drug interdiction as a top priority; respondent's prioritization of gang interdiction, gang prevention initiatives, and data collection and information sharing technology to support crime-fighting strategies, show clear support for law enforcement from respondents across the criminal justice spectrum.

Question 3: Funding Allocation


Question: If you were to allocate funding among the seven JAG Program Purpose Areas, what would be the percentages you would assign to each area?

Possible Answers: Law Enforcement, Prosecution, Court, Defense and Indigent Defense, Prevention and Education, Corrections and Com-

munity Corrections, Drug Treatment and Enforcement, Planning, Evaluation and Technology Improvement, Crime Victim and Witness Protection

While every respondent category selected the purpose area under which they could receive funding as the purpose area to receive the largest share of limited JAG funds, there were two common themes that came out of this question. The common themes within respondents' allocations were: (1) the belief that funds should be spent across purpose areas, and (2) almost universal support for law enforcement and prevention/education initiatives getting a larger share of limited JAG funds. The following charts provide information about California's 2012 JAG Spending and the national picture of how State Administering Agencies (SAA) spent JAG funds in 2012, as well as groupings of respondent's answers showing how they would allocate the JAG funding.


2012 JAG Spending: California vs. National




Respondents' Hypothetical Allocations

Purpose Areas: (1) Law Enforcement (2) Prosecution, Courts, Defense (3) Prevention and Education (4) Corrections and Community Corrections (5) Drug Treatment and Enforcement (6) Planning, Evaluation and Technology (7) Crime Victim and Witness Protection


Courts (Prosecution, Courts, Defense)




Corrections & Community Corrections



Law Enforcement



Social Services (SS, SA, MH, PH, CBO)



JAG's Seven Purpose Areas

B-7 JAG 2013 STAKEHOLDER SURVEY, EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose Area 1 - Law Enforcement

Question: Rank in order of importance with 1 being the most important (7 being the least important), the areas of need for Program Purpose Area 1 – Law Enforcement, includes multijurisdictional task forces and other policing efforts:

Possible Answers: Gang Violence Reduction, Drug Enforcement, Violent Crime Reduction Initiatives, Gun Violence Reduction, Technology Driven Police Strategies, Human Trafficking, Other Services to Address Gaps in Law Enforcement

Overall, gang violence reduction was chosen as the top priority by almost every category of respondents. For those that did not rank it as the top priority, it was selected as their second priority. The most common second priority se-

JAG Purpose Area Priorities: LE			
	Priority 1	Priority 2	Priority 3
Law Enforcement	Gang Violence Reduction	Drug Enforcement	Violent Crime Reduction Initiatives
Correction & Community Corrections	Gang Violence Reduction	Violent Crime Reduction Initiatives	Drug Enforcement
Admin Policy	Gang Violence Reduction	Violent Crime Reduction Initiatives	Drug Enforcement
Courts (Pros, Courts, PD)	Gang Violence Reduction	Violent Crime Reduction Initiatives	Gun Violence Reduction
Victims	Violent Crime Reduction Initiatives	Gang Violence Reduction	Drug Enforcement
Social Services (CBO, SS, SA, MH, PH)	Violent Crime Reduction Initiatives	Gang Violence Reduction	Gun Violence Reduction
Education & JJ	Gang Violence Reduction	Violent Crime Reduction Initiatives	Gun Violence Reduction

lected was violent crime reduction initiatives followed by drug enforcement and gun violence reduction. While gang violence reduction was the number one priority for law enforcement in the aggregate; drug enforcement was chosen as the top priority by the largest number of respondents. In addition to law enforcement, the corrections subset of the corrections and community corrections category was the only other group who placed drug enforcement in their top two priorities. The lowest overall priority across respondents was

services to address gaps in law enforcement, followed closely by technology driven policing strategies and human trafficking.

Respondents' Comments

Law enforcement comments in this section mainly addressed issues related to the limited funding for high level enforcement efforts and efforts that concentrate on the intersection of drugs, gangs, and violent crime.

Potential Model Programs SAAs Have Used to Address Priority Areas: [The Cincinnati Initiative to Reduce Violence \(CIRV\)](#), [The High Point Drug Market Initiative](#) and [Maryland's Violence Prevention Initiative \(VPI\)](#).

Purpose Area 2 - Prosecution, Courts, Defense and Indigent Defense

Question: Rank in order of importance with 1 being the most important (9 being the least important), the areas of need for Program Purpose Area 2 – Prosecution, Court, Defense and Indigent Defense Programs, includes programs

JAG Purpose Area Priorities: Prosecution, Courts, Defense and Indigent Defense			
	Priority 1	Priority 2	Priority 3
Law Enforcement	Gun/Gang Prosecution	Violent Crime Prosecution and Defense	Problem Solving Courts (i.e. Mental Health, Veterans, Drug, Reentry)
Correction & Community Corrections	Problem Solving Courts (i.e. Mental Health, Veterans, Drug, Reentry)	Gun/Gang Prosecution	Violent Crime Prosecution and Defense
Admin Policy	Gun/Gang Prosecution	Problem Solving Courts (i.e. Mental Health, Veterans, Drug, Reentry)	Violent Crime Prosecution and Defense
Courts (Pros, Courts, PD)	Problem Solving Courts (i.e. Mental Health, Veterans, Drug, Reentry)	Violent Crime Prosecution and Defense	Gun/Gang Prosecution
Victims	Violent Crime Prosecution and Defense	Problem Solving Courts (i.e. Mental Health, Veterans, Drug, Reentry)	Gun/Gang Prosecution
Social Services (CBO, SS, SA, MH, PH)	Problem Solving Courts (i.e. Mental Health, Veterans, Drug, Reentry)	Court-based Restorative Justice Initiatives	Innovations and Indigent Defense
Education & JJ	Problem Solving Courts (i.e. Mental Health, Veterans, Drug, Reentry)	Court-based Restorative Justice Initiatives	Innovations and Indigent Defense

to improve the justice system's response to crime through effective criminal defense, prosecution, and adjudication of offenders:

Possible Answers: Innovations in Indigent Defense, Gun/Gang Prosecution, Problem Solving Courts (i.e. Mental Health, Veterans, Drug, Reentry), Pretrial Initiatives, White-Collar Crime Prosecution and Defense, Court-Based Restorative Justice Initiatives, Defense Counsel Training to Improve Court Representation, Violent Crime Prosecution and Defense, Other Services to Address Gaps in Prosecution, Court, Defense, and Indigent Defense Programs

Overall, the majority of categories of the justice system indicated that problem solving courts should be prioritized within the Prosecution, Courts, Defense and Indigent Defense purpose area. While this type of initiative received almost universal support across respondent categories and levels of government, gang/gun prosecution, and violent crime prosecution and defense were also selected among the top three priorities for the majority of traditional criminal justice system partners.

Within this purpose area involved stakeholders prioritized initiatives in the following way:

Courts

1. Problem Solving Courts
2. Gun/Gang Prosecution
3. Court-Based Restorative Justice Initiatives

JAG Purpose Area Priorities: Prevention and Education			
JAG 2013 STAKEHOLDER SURVEY, EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	Priority 1	Priority 2	Priority 3
Law Enforcement	Gangs	Substance Abuse	Juvenile Delinquency
Correction & Community Corrections	Gangs	Juvenile Delinquency	Substance Abuse
Admin Policy	Gangs	Substance Abuse	Juvenile Delinquency
Courts (Pros, Courts, PD)	Gangs	Juvenile Delinquency	Substance Abuse
Victims	Gangs	Juvenile Delinquency	School Violence
Social Services (CBO, SS, SA, MH, PH)	Juvenile Delinquency	Gangs	Substance Abuse
Education & JJ	Juvenile Delinquency	Gangs	Substance Abuse

Prosecution

1. Gun/Gang Prosecution
2. Violent Crime Prosecutions and Defense
3. Problem Solving Courts

Indigent Defense

1. Innovations in Indigent Defense
2. Problem Solving Courts
3. Pretrial Initiatives

Purpose Area 3 - Prevention and Education

Question: Rank in order of importance with 1 being the most important (6 being the least important), the areas of need for Program Purpose Area 3 – Prevention and Education Programs, includes projects which address public safety concerns:

Potential Answers: Gangs, Juvenile Delinquency, School Violence, Substance Abuse, Gun Violence, Other Services to Address Gaps in Prevention and Education Programs

Within this purpose area, respondents almost universally selected gang initiatives as their top priority. While this was not selected as the top priority for

either the juvenile justice community or the education community; it was selected as one of the top three priorities for every category of respondent. In addition to gang initiatives, respondents prioritized programming that addresses juvenile delinquency and substance abuse.

Potential Model Programs SAAs Have Used to Address Priority Areas: [Gang Resistance Education And Training \(G.R.E.A.T.\) Program](#), [Big Brothers Big Sisters \(BBBS\) Community-Based Mentoring \(CBM\) Program](#), and [Adolescent Transitions Program](#).

Purpose Area 4 - Corrections and Community Corrections

Question: Rank in order of importance with 1 being the most important (13 being the least important), the areas of need in Program Purpose Area 4 – Corrections and Community Corrections Programs, includes non-residential, residential, aftercare, and other programs to reduce recidivism programs for offenders:

Potential Answers: Alternatives to Incarceration—Residential, Alternatives to Incarceration—Non-Residential, Gender Specific Services, Jail-Based Education and Training Services, Re-Entry Planning, e.g. Integrated Case Management, Smart Probation, e.g. Risk-Based Probation Strategies, Restorative Justice, e.g. Restitution, Victim-Offender Reconciliation, Juvenile Justice Options to State and Local Commitments, Recidivism Reduction Programs, Disproportionate Minority Contact Strategies, Technical Assistance and Training on Evidence Based Practices, Other Services to Address Gaps in Corrections and Community Corrections Programs

Within the Corrections and Community Corrections purpose area there was great support for alternatives to incarceration. Respondents in almost every category placed it within their top three priority areas. While residential alternatives were prioritized first, non-residential alternatives were also

chosen as one of the top three priority investments within this purpose area. In addition to the focus on alternatives to incarceration, almost all respondent categories placed the need for enhanced Reentry Planning within their top three priority areas. When looking at how respondents from the correction and community corrections fields answered this question we see the following priorities:

Corrections:

1. Alternatives to Incarceration-Non-Residential
2. Alternatives to Incarceration—Residential
3. Smart Probation, e.g. Risk-Based Probation Strategies

Parole/Probation:

1. Smart Probation, e.g. Risk-Based Probation Strategies
2. Re-Entry Planning, e.g. Integrated Case Management
3. Alternatives to Incarceration-Residential

Potential Program Elements SAAs Have Used to Address Priority Areas:

1. Use of a validated risk assessment tool
2. A focus on services for high-risk offenders (as determined by a validated risk assessment tool)
3. Interventions focused on changing offender thinking and behavior (use of modeling, de-confliction and de-escalation techniques)
4. Initiatives that have behavioral health, supported employment and housing components or strong referral networks
5. The use of peer (ex-offender) mentors or initiatives that employ rehabilitated ex-offenders (Anti-social peers is the number one predictor of recidivism over race, class, employment or marital status)

JAG Purpose Area Priorities: Corrections and Community Corrections

	Priority 1	Priority 2	Priority 3
Law Enforcement	Jail-based Education and Training Services	Smart Probation (e.g., Risk-based Probation Strategies)	Re-entry Planning (e.g., Integrated Case Management)
Correction & Community Corrections	Alternatives to Incarceration - Residential	Re-entry Planning (e.g., Integrated Case Management)	Alternatives to Incarceration - Non-Residential
Admin Policy	Alternatives to Incarceration - Residential	Re-entry Planning (e.g., Integrated Case Management)	Alternatives to Incarceration - Non-Residential
Courts (Pros, Courts, PD)	Alternatives to Incarceration - Residential	Re-entry Planning (e.g., Integrated Case Management)	Alternatives to Incarceration - Non-Residential
Victims	Jail-based Education and Training Services	Smart Probation (e.g., Risk-based Probation Strategies)	Re-entry Planning (e.g., Integrated Case Management)
Social Services (CBO, SS, SA, MH, PH)	Alternatives to Incarceration - Residential	Re-entry Planning (e.g., Integrated Case Management)	Alternatives to Incarceration - Non-Residential
Education & JJ	Alternatives to Incarceration - Residential	Alternatives to Incarceration - Non-Residential	Juvenile Justice Options to State and Local Commitments

JAG Purpose Area Priorities: Drug Treatment and Enforcement

B-7 JAG 2013	STAKEHOLDER SURVEY, EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	Priority 1	Priority 2	Priority 3
Law Enforcement	Drug Enforcement Programs	In-Custody Treatment	Community-based Outpatient Treatment	Community-based Residential Treatment
Correction & Community Corrections	In-Custody Treatment	Community-based Outpatient Treatment	Community-based Residential Treatment	Community-based Outpatient Treatment
Admin Policy	Community-based Outpatient Treatment	In-Custody Treatment	Community-based Residential Treatment	Community-based Outpatient Treatment
Courts (Pros, Courts, PD)	In-Custody Treatment	Community-based Residential Treatment	Community-based Outpatient Treatment	Community-based Residential Treatment
Victims	In-Custody Treatment	Community-based Residential Treatment	Community-based Outpatient Treatment	Community-based Residential Treatment
Social Services (CBO, SS, SA, MH, PH)	Community-based Outpatient Treatment	Community-based Residential Treatment	In-Custody Treatment	Community-based Residential Treatment
Education & JJ	Community-based Outpatient Treatment	Community-based Residential Treatment	In-Custody Treatment	Community-based Residential Treatment

Purpose Area 5 – Drug Treatment and Enforcement

Question: Rank in order of importance with 1 being the most important (5 being the least important), the areas of need in Program Purpose Area 5 – Drug Treatment and Enforcement, includes programs and services for substance abusing offenders:

Potential Answers: In Custody Treatment, Community-Based Outpatient Treatment, Community-Based Residential Treatment, Drug Enforcement Programs, Other Services to Address Gaps in Drug Treatment and Enforcement Programs

Within the Drug Treatment and Enforcement purpose area there was overwhelming support for treatment over enforcement. In fact, only the law enforcement community (priority 1) and the prosecution subset of the courts category (priority 3) selected drug enforcement as one of their top three priorities. Overall, the focus on

demand reduction over supply reduction is consistent with the comments and priorities selected in other questions. Although there was great agreement within the criminal justice system on the importance of treatment there was little agreement on where these services should be provided (outpatient, residential or in custody). Within the social service community, who will most likely provide these services, community-based outpatient treatment services were the top priority across all sub-categories (community-based organizations, social service organizations, substance abuse organizations, mental health organizations, and those within the public health field).

Purpose Area 6 – Planning Evaluation and Technology

Question: Rank in order of importance with 1 being the most important (8 being the least important), the areas of need for Program Purpose Area 6 – Planning, Evaluation, and Technology Programs, includes projects to update IT equipment,

records and management systems, developing communication networks to create information sharing among agencies:

Potential Answers: Data collection and information sharing technology to support crime-fighting strategies, Technology to support case management, Data collection and information sharing to advance innovative use of crime analysis across jurisdictions in real time, Data collection and information sharing to support offender management, Data collection and information sharing between criminal justice and health/mental health and other community agencies and services, Data collection and information sharing to assist in strategic planning, Research, evaluation, and technology to support program evaluation, Other Services to Address Gaps in Planning, Evaluation and Technology Programs

While there was no single category that was considered the top priority within this purpose area there was universal

support for data collection and information sharing technology to support crime fighting strategies and for technology to support case management. Both initiatives ranked as one of the top three priority areas. In addition to the continued support for law enforcement efforts to improve crime fighting strategies, there was also strong support among the enforcement community for “data collection and information sharing technology to support crime analysis among jurisdictions in real time.” Among the courts, social service, and juvenile justice fields there was strong support for “data collection and information sharing between criminal justice and health/mental health and other community agencies and services.”

Potential Program Elements to Keep in Mind When Addressing Priority Areas: In order to ensure that any information system you are building or purchasing will have the necessary interoperability across elements of the justice system, across levels of government or across state lines; technology should consider the standards laid out by [The Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative \(Global\)](#) and the [National Information Exchange Model \(NEIM\)](#).

Purpose Area 7 – Crime Victim and Witness

Question: Rank in order of importance with 1 being the most important (6 being the least important), the areas of need for Program Purpose Area 7 – Crime Victim and Witness Protection (other than crime victim compensation), includes victim advocacy, victim notification, and witness programs:

B-7 JAG 2013 STAKEHOLDER SURVEY, EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

JAG Purpose Area Priorities: Planning, Evaluation and Technology			
	Priority 1	Priority 2	Priority 3
Law Enforcement	Data collection and information sharing technology to support crime-fighting strategies	Data collection and information sharing to advance innovative use of crime analysis across jurisdictions in real time	Technology to support case management
Correction & Community Corrections	Data collection and information sharing technology to support crime-fighting strategies	Technology to support case management	Data collection and information sharing to advance innovative use of crime analysis across jurisdictions in real time
Admin Policy	Data collection and information sharing technology to support crime-fighting strategies	Data collection and information sharing to advance innovative use of crime analysis across jurisdictions in real time	Technology to support case management
Courts (Pros, Courts, PD)	Technology to support case management	Data collection and information sharing technology to support crime-fighting strategies	Data collection and information sharing between criminal justice and health/mental health and other community agencies and services
Victims	Data collection and information sharing technology to support crime-fighting strategies	Data collection and information sharing to advance innovative use of crime analysis across jurisdictions in real time	Technology to support case management
Social Services (CBO, SS, SA, MH, PH)	Data collection and information sharing between criminal justice and health/mental health and other community agencies and services	Technology to support case management	Data collection and information sharing technology to support crime-fighting strategies
Education & JJ	Data collection and information sharing between criminal justice and health/mental health and other community agencies and services	Technology to support case management	Data collection and information sharing technology to support crime-fighting strategies

JAG Purpose Area Priorities: Crime Victim and Witness Protection			
	Priority 1	Priority 2	Priority 3
Law Enforcement	Children exposed to violence	Direct victim services (e.g., advocacy, accompaniment)	Witness intimidation prevention
Correction & Community Corrections	Children exposed to violence	Direct victim services (e.g., advocacy, accompaniment)	Restorative Justice (e.g., restitution, mediation, and conferencing)
Admin Policy	Children exposed to violence	Direct victim services (e.g., advocacy, accompaniment)	Restorative Justice (e.g., restitution, mediation, and conferencing)
Courts (Pros, Courts, PD)	Children exposed to violence	Direct victim services (e.g., advocacy, accompaniment)	Restorative Justice (e.g., restitution, mediation, and conferencing)
Victims	Direct victim services (e.g., advocacy, accompaniment)	Children exposed to violence	Witness intimidation prevention
Social Services (CBO, SS, SA, MH, PH)	Children exposed to violence	Direct victim services (e.g., advocacy, accompaniment)	Restorative Justice (e.g., restitution, mediation, and conferencing)
Education & JJ	Children exposed to violence	Restorative Justice (e.g., restitution, mediation, and conferencing)	Direct victim services (e.g., advocacy, accompaniment)

Potential Answers: Children Exposed to Violence, Court School for Witnesses, Direct Victim Services, e.g., advocacy, accompaniment, notification, Restorative Justice, e.g., restitution, mediation, conferencing, Witness Intimidation Prevention, Other Services to Address Gaps in Crime Victim and Witness Protection Programs

Within the Crime Victim and Witness Protection purpose area there was strong support for initiatives that work with children exposed to violence. This category received the most universal and the strongest support across groups and across questions within the survey. In addition, direct victim services (e.g., advocacy, accompaniment, notification) received universal support and this category ranked as one of the top three priority areas for the majority of elements within the justice system. While not as universally supported, restorative justice initiatives (restitution, mediation and conferencing) was also selected by every group as part of its top four priority areas.

Potential Program Models SAAs Have Used to Address Priority Areas: [Cognitive Behavioral Intervention for Trauma in Schools \(CBITS\)](#), [Trauma-Focused Cognitive Behavioral Therapy \(TF-CBT\)](#), and [Victim-Impact Panels](#), [Victim-Offender Mediation](#), [Family Group Conferences](#).

Endnotes

In social science research, snowball sampling (or chain sampling, chain-referral sampling, referral sampling) is a non-probability sampling technique where existing study subjects recruit future subjects from among their peers. Thus the sample group appears to grow like a rolling snowball. As the sample builds up, enough data is gathered to be useful for research. This sampling technique was used in an effort to solicit as much input from the field as possible. By asking survey respondents to pass along the survey to others in their field, BSCC was able increase the number and diversity of respondents. This is especially important as BSCC wanted to reach out to non-traditional stakeholders who are not on the agency's or the previous JAG administrator's (Cal Emergency Management Agency) mailing lists.

Attachment B-7

Appendix

B-7 JAG 2013 STAKEHOLDER SURVEY, EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

California Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant 2013 Strategic Plan Development Survey

The Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) is the administering agency for the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program. The BSCC provides oversight of the JAG program, develops and approves the state strategy, prioritizes the program purpose areas for funding, reviews grant proposals, and determines awards. In 2012, California's JAG program allocation was just under \$20 million.

To receive the JAG funding, the BSCC must develop a four-year state strategy, which will guide the spending under this federal grant program. To develop the state strategy, the BSCC reviews current data and information and obtains input from criminal justice professionals and other interested parties across the state about the state's criminal justice program needs within the allowable JAG program purpose areas.

The allowable program purpose areas of the JAG program are as follows:

Purpose Area 1: Law Enforcement

Purpose Area 2: Prosecution, Court, Defense and Indigent Defense

Purpose Area 3: Prevention and Education

Purpose Area 4: Corrections and Community Corrections

Purpose Area 5: Drug Treatment and Enforcement

Purpose Area 6: Planning, Evaluation and Technology Improvement

Purpose Area 7: Crime Victim and Witness Protection

The BSCC developed this survey in an effort to obtain a broad spectrum of input from criminal justice professionals and other interested parties throughout the state and will use the survey results to assist in developing the new four-year direction and strategy. Unless specifically designated the survey items to be ranked are for either adult or juvenile programs. Your input is very important and much appreciated.

The answers to this survey are confidential. All reporting of results from the survey will be done in aggregate. You will need an email address to complete this survey and only one completed survey per email addressed is allowed. No effort will be made to identify any respondent. However, to assist the BSCC with compiling and comparing the survey responses, please indicate the county you live in or the county your agency serves, whether it is a rural community, and which level of government you represent, if applicable:

Survey questions begin on the next page.

Pre-Survey Questions

1. Name of County **B-7 JAG 2013 STAKEHOLDER SURVEY, EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. Do you live in or serve a rural community?

Yes or No

3. What level of government do you serve?

- Local
- State
- Tribal
- N/A

4. My role or the role of my agency in the criminal justice system is as follows (select only one category):

- Administration and Policy
- Community-Based Organization
- Corrections
- Courts
- Defense
- Education
- Juvenile Justice
- Law Enforcement
- Mental Health
- Parole/Probation
- Prosecution
- Public Health
- Social Services
- Substance Abuse Treatment
- Victim Assistance
- Interested Citizen
- Other (please specify)

Attachment B-7

Core Questions

1. In California, JAG funding is primarily used to support the efforts of state and local multijurisdictional drug enforcement task forces throughout the state, e.g., Anti-Drug Abuse, Crackdown Multi-Community Task Force, Marijuana Suppression, Campaign Against Marijuana Planting, Drug Endangered Children Training and Technical Assistance.

Do you believe this the best use of this grant money?

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neither Agree Nor Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

1a. In the space below, provide a brief explanation of your response.

2. Of the seven JAG Program Purpose Areas listed below; rank in order of importance with 1 being the most important, which areas reflect the best use of JAG funding for your community or for the state:

B-7 JAG 2013 STAKEHOLDER SURVEY, EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Law Enforcement
- Prosecution, Court, Defense and Indigent Defense
- Prevention and Education
- Corrections and Community Corrections
- Drug Treatment and Enforcement
- Planning, Evaluation and Technology Improvement
- Crime Victim and Witness Protection

3. If you were to allocate funding among the seven JAG Program Purpose Areas, what would be the percentages you would assign to each area? YOUR TOTAL MUST EQUAL 100% (Note: All fields must have a numeric value between 0-100 before you can proceed.)

- Law Enforcement
- Prosecution, Court, Defense and Indigent Defense
- Prevention and Education
- Corrections and Community Corrections
- Drug Treatment and Enforcement
- Planning, Evaluation and Technology Improvement
- Crime Victim and Witness Protection

JAG Purpose Area Questions

1. Rank in order of importance with 1 being the most important, the areas of need for Program Purpose Area 1 – Law Enforcement, includes multijurisdictional task forces and other policing efforts:

- Gang Violence Reduction
- Drug Enforcement
- Violent Crime Reduction Initiatives
- Gun Violence Reduction
- Technology Driven Police Strategies (i.e. Hot Spot, Community Policing)
- Human Trafficking
- Other Services to Address Gaps in Law Enforcement

1a. Feel free to specify the other in the space provided below:

2. Rank in order of importance with 1 being the most important, the areas of need for Program Purpose Area 2 – Prosecution, Court, Defense and Indigent Defense Programs, includes programs to improve the justice system’s response to crime through effective criminal defense, prosecution, and adjudication of offenders:

B-7 JAG 2013 STAKEHOLDER SURVEY, EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Innovations in Indigent Defense
- Gun/Gang Prosecution
- Problem Solving Courts, i.e. Mental Health, Veterans, Drug, Reentry
- Pretrial Initiatives
- White-Collar Crime Prosecution and Defense
- Court-Based Restorative Justice Initiatives
- Defense Counsel Training to Improve Court Representation
- Violent Crime Prosecution and Defense
- Other Services to Address Gaps in Prosecution, Court, Defense and Indigent Defense Programs

2a. Feel free to specify the other in the space provided below:

3. Rank in order of importance with 1 being the most important, the areas of need for Program Purpose Area 3 – Prevention and Education Programs, includes projects which address public safety concerns:

- Gangs
- Juvenile Delinquency
- School Violence
- Substance Abuse
- Gun Violence
- Other Services to Address Gaps in Prevention and Education Programs

3a. Feel free to specify the other in the space provided below:

4. Rank in order of importance with 1 being the most important, the areas of need in Program Purpose Area 4 – Corrections and Community Corrections Programs, includes non-residential, residential, aftercare, and other programs to reduce recidivism programs for offenders:

- Alternatives to Incarceration – Residential
- Alternatives to Incarceration – Non-Residential
- Gender Specific Services
- Jail-Based Education and Training Services
- Re-Entry Planning, e.g. Integrated Case Management
- Smart Probation, e.g. Risk-Based Probation Strategies
- Restorative Justice, e.g. Restitution, Victim-Offender Reconciliation
- Juvenile Justice Options to State and Local Commitments
- Recidivism Reduction Programs
- Disproportionate Minority Contact Strategies
- Technical Assistance and Training on Evidence Based Practices
- Other Services to Address Gaps in Corrections and Community Corrections Programs

4a. Feel free to specify the other in the space provided below:

5. Rank in order of importance with 1 being the most important, the areas of need in Program Purpose Area 5 – Drug Treatment and Enforcement, includes programs and services for substance abusing offenders:

B-7 JAG 2013 STAKEHOLDER SURVEY, EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- In Custody Treatment
- Community-Based Outpatient Treatment
- Community-Based Residential Treatment
- Drug Enforcement Programs
- Other Services to Address Gaps in Drug Treatment and Enforcement Programs

5a. Feel free to specify the other in the space provided below:

6. Rank in order of importance with 1 being the most important, the areas of need for Program Purpose Area 6 – Planning, Evaluation, and Technology Programs, includes projects to update IT equipment, records and management systems, developing communication networks to create information sharing among agencies:

- Data collection and information sharing technology to support crime-fighting strategies
- Technology to support case management
- Data collection and information sharing to advance innovative use of crime analysis across jurisdictions in real time
- Data collection and information sharing to support offender management
- Data collection and information sharing between criminal justice and health/mental health and other community agencies and services
- Data collection and information sharing to assist in strategic planning
- Research, evaluation, and technology to support program evaluation
- Other Services to Address Gaps in Planning, Evaluation and Technology Programs

6a. Feel free to specify the other in the space provided below:

7. Rank in order of importance with 1 being the most important, the areas of need for Program Purpose Area 7 – Crime Victim and Witness Protection (other than crime victim compensation), includes victim advocacy, victim notification, and witness programs:

- Children Exposed to Violence
- Court School for Witnesses
- Direct Victim Services, e. g., advocacy, accompaniment, notification
- Restorative Justice, e.g., restitution, mediation, conferencing
- Witness Intimidation Prevention
- Other Services to Address Gaps in Crime Victim and Witness Protection Programs

7a. Feel free to specify the other in the space provided below:

About the Survey

As part of the state's planning process for its federal Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) allocation, the California Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) began working with the National Criminal Justice Association (NCJA) to develop a stakeholder engagement strategy to inform the planning process in the development of the four-year strategy for the JAG program. As part of this engagement strategy, BSCC sought input from traditional and non-traditional partners across the state on:

- 1) past investments;
- 2) priority project types and initiatives within the 7 JAG purpose areas; and,
- 3) priority purpose areas for funding.

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.

About NCJA and NCJP

Based in Washington, D.C., the National Criminal Justice Association (NCJA) represents state, tribal and local governments on crime prevention and crime control issues. Its members represent all facets of the criminal and juvenile justice community, from law enforcement, corrections, prosecution, defense, courts, victim-witness services and educational institutions to federal, state and local elected officials.

The National Center for Justice Planning (NCJP) is a cooperative effort between NCJA and the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) and provides strategic planning and evidence-based practice resources for states and localities on a variety of criminal justice issues. Additional on and off site technical assistance and training are available to states upon request.

National Center for Justice Planning

720 7th St., Washington, DC, 20001
Tel: 202.628.8550 Fax : 202.448.1723

www.ncjp.org

