

California Violence Intervention & Prevention(CalVIP) Grant

Executive Steering Committee

Issue Paper: To Guide the Development of a Request for Proposals (RFP)

Introduction

The Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) is a 13-member Board whose members are prescribed by statute, appointed by the Governor, the Judicial Branch and the Legislature. The Board Chair reports directly to the Governor.

Many of the decisions made by the Board directly impact the day-to-day operations of local public safety agencies and service providers. To ensure successful program design and implementation, it is essential that those impacted are included in the decision-making process. The BSCC uses Executive Steering Committees (ESCs) to inform decision-making related to the Board's programs, including distributing grant funds and developing regulations. ESCs help the BSCC to work collaboratively in changing environments, complete work on time and create positive partnerships critical for success. This collaborative approach is supported by BSCC's authorizing statute, Penal Code section 6024 (c), which states:

The Board shall regularly seek advice from a balanced range of stakeholders and subject matter experts on issues pertaining to adult corrections, juvenile justice, and gang problems relevant to its mission. Toward this end, the Board shall seek to ensure that its efforts

1. are systematically informed by experts and stakeholders with the most specific knowledge concerning the subject matter,
2. include the participation of those who must implement a board decision and are impacted by a board decision, and
3. promote collaboration and innovative problem solving consistent with the mission of the Board.

ESCs are appointed by the Board, as the need arises, to carry out specified tasks and to submit findings and recommendations to the BSCC. The Board then approves, rejects or revises those recommendations. This ESC was formed specifically for the California Violence Intervention & Prevention (CalVIP) grant, to develop a Request for Proposals (RFP), score the proposals submitted in response to that RFP and make funding recommendations to the Board. It is chaired by a Board Member, Chief Andy Mills of the Santa Cruz Police Department.

This Issue Paper is presented to the ESC as a guide to assist in meaningful and focused discussions on key topics and related decision points to help the Committee develop an RFP to present to the BSCC in November 2021.

As the group moves through the Issue Paper, staff will be listening to the discussion and taking notes. It is likely that some issues will generate more discussion than others; however, it is not necessary to reach a consensus on every issue. Staff will attempt to

identify issues that remain outstanding at the end of the meeting and suggest next steps. Staff will incorporate decisions made and priorities discussed within a draft RFP. The ESC will review the draft RFP and provide feedback via email, directly with lead staff. As part of this committee process, staff will lead the ESC in the development of the rating criteria which will be used to score the proposals.

Background

Formerly known as the California Gang Reduction, Intervention & Prevention (CalGRIP) grant, the State Legislature established the California Violence Intervention & Prevention (CalVIP) in FY 2017-18, moving the grant away from its focus on gangs to allow jurisdictions to focus more broadly on the types of violence impacting their communities.

Until FY 2017-18, eligibility for the CalVIP grant was open only to California cities, who were required to pass through a minimum of 50 percent of the funds to one or more community-based organizations (CBOs). With the FY 2017-18 Budget, eligibility was extended to include CBOs who can now apply directly. The implications of this change will be discussed later in this paper.

Historically, the CalVIP Grant Program has received approximately \$9 million each year. This year, the state budget provided a \$200 million one-time augmentation across the next three fiscal years to enhance the CalVIP Grant Program. In addition to this one-time increase, the BSCC anticipates CalVIP will continue to receive its annual \$9 million allocation,¹ which will be used to fulfill the BSCC’s ongoing obligations for existing grantees.

A display of the one-time and ongoing allocations is provided below:

Fiscal Year (FY)	One-time Appropriation	Ongoing Appropriation	Total Funding	*Administer and Support	**City of Los Angeles	Total Funding Available for Competitive Grants
FY 2021-22	\$67,000,000	\$9,000,000	\$76,000,000	(\$3,800,000)	(\$2,000,000)	\$70,200,000
FY 2022-23	\$67,000,000	\$9,000,000	\$76,000,000	(\$3,800,000)	(\$2,000,000)	\$70,200,000
FY 2023-24	\$66,000,000	\$9,000,000	\$75,000,000	(\$3,500,000)	(\$2,000,000)	\$69,500,000
Total	\$200,000,000	\$27,000,000	\$227,000,000	(\$11,100,000)	(\$6,000,000)	\$209,900,000

* Pursuant to SB 129, 5% is allocated to BSCC for cost to administer and support CalVIP.

** Per statute, the City of Los Angeles will receive a non-competitive award of \$2,000,000 per year.

¹ Provided funding is appropriated in the FY 2022-23, and 2023-24 State Budget Acts

Legislation Authorizing CalVIP

There are two pieces of legislation that govern the CalVIP grant (copies of the full texts are located on page 31 and 33 of this paper):

- **FY 2021-22 State Budget Act** (Senate Bill 129) contains the authorizing language and provides the vehicle by which the grant is funded.
- **Assembly Bill 1603** (Wicks, 2019), also known as the *Break the Cycle of Violence Act*, was signed by the Governor on October 11, 2019. This bill codifies the establishment of the CalVIP grant program and the authority and duties of BSCC in administering the program, including the selection criteria for grants and reporting requirements to the Legislature. It contains additional guidance for how the funds should be distributed.

Purpose of CalVIP:

“Improve public health and safety by supporting effective violence reduction initiatives in communities that are disproportionately impacted by violence, particularly group-member involved homicides, shootings and aggravated assaults.” (AB 1603)

There are several statutory requirements that govern how the CalVIP grants are administered. The ESC does not have the authority to change or eliminate these requirements and they will guide the ESC’s decision-making. In some cases, the ESC must decide how to operationalize them for purposes of the RFP.

- **Match Contribution.** All applicants shall provide a 100-percent match to state funds awarded (cash or in-kind).
- **Eligibility.** Only cities and community-based organizations (CBOs) are eligible to apply for a CalVIP grant.
- **Pass-Through Requirement for Cities.** City applicants must agree to distribute at least 50 percent of the grant funds it receives to one or more of the following: a) CBOs or b) public agencies (other than the lead applicant agency) that are primarily dedicated to community safety or violence prevention.
- **Cities with Population of 200,000 or Less.** At least two grants shall be awarded to cities with populations of 200,000 or less.

(According to the California Department of Finance, 459 of California’s 487 cities reported populations of 200,000 or less in 2020. This represents 94 percent of California’s cities. Historically, BSCC has been able to meet this requirement without special conditions on the grant.)

- **Funding Threshold.** A single grant shall not exceed \$2,000,000 per year.

(The ESC may choose to set lower funding caps or create a graduated funding structure within that threshold, to be discussed later in this paper.)

Issues for Discussion

Issues for discussion are listed below; however, the ESC does not need to take these issues in documented order. Some issues are interconnected across sections and may require members to pause one issue to have a more in-depth conversation on a corresponding issue in another section.

At the end of each section, there will be one or more **ESC Decision Points** marked for ESC consideration.

1. Grant Term.....	page 5
2. Target Population.....	page 6
3. Applicant Eligibility	page 7
4. Types of Strategies to be Funded	page 11
5. Other Applicant Criteria.....	page 18
6. Funding Considerations	page 20
7. Grant Application Budget Considerations.....	page 24
8. Evaluation Requirements	page 26
9. RFP Logistics	page 28
10. State Budget Act of 2021-22.....	page 31
11. AB 1603	page 33

1. Grant Term

BSCC plans to award the CalVIP grants on July 1, 2022. The funds revert on June 30, 2026. The maximum amount of time the funds can be in the field, allowing for an adequate close-out and liquidation period, would be 3½ years. Staff therefore recommends the following grant term:

Recommended Grant Term: July 1, 2022 to December 31, 2025
(3-year service delivery + 6 months evaluation)

Strategy Implementation, Service Delivery & Data Collection

July 1, 2022 —————> June 30, 2025 (3 years)

Analysis of Data and Completion of Final Evaluation Report

July 1, 2025 —————> December 31, 2025 (6 months)

1. ESC Decision Point. Discuss, consider and make decisions on the following:

Does the ESC agree with setting a 3½ year grant term? Are there other suggestions or considerations?

NOTES:

2. Target Population for CalVIP Funded Services

Statutory guidelines for CalVIP.

AB 1603-requires that: “These initiatives shall be primarily focused on providing violence intervention services to the small segment of the population that is identified as having the highest risk of perpetrating or being victimized by violence in the near future.”

2. ESC Decision Point. Discuss, consider and make decisions on the following:

Should the target population for CalVIP applicants be strictly defined? If so, what guidance should we provide to applicants for how to identify that target population? What does it mean to be “highest risk?”

- Criminal history (i.e., charged with, arrested, or convicted with a crime?)
 - Only certain types of crimes or any crime?
 - Self-reported or verified by law enforcement?

- Prior victim of a crime
 - Only certain types of crimes or any crime?
 - Self-reported or verified by law enforcement?

NOTES:

3. Applicant Eligibility

“Disproportionately impacted by violence.”

Under past CalVIP RFPs, all cities and CBOs in California were eligible to apply (though there were preference points for cities that met certain criteria related to violent crime rates). That is no longer the case. AB 1603 restricts eligibility based on certain criteria. AB 1603 mandates that: “CalVIP grants shall be made on a competitive basis to cities that are disproportionately impacted by violence, and to community-based organizations that serve the residents of those cities.”

The statute specifies that “a city is disproportionately impacted by violence if any of the following are true:

- (1) The city experienced 20 or more homicides per calendar year during two or more of the three calendar years immediately preceding the grant application for which the Department of Justice has available data.
- (2) The city experienced 10 or more homicides per calendar year and had a homicide rate that was at least 50 percent higher than the statewide homicide rate during two or more of the three calendar years immediately preceding the grant application for line which the Department of Justice has available data.
- (3) An applicant otherwise demonstrates a unique and compelling need for additional resources to address the impact of homicides, shootings, and aggravated assaults in the applicant’s community.

According to BSCC’s data analysis², there are **11 cities** that will be eligible for CalVIP funding according to definition (1):

- | | |
|----------------|-------------------|
| 1. Bakersfield | 7. San Bernardino |
| 2. Fresno | 8. San Diego |
| 3. Long Beach | 9. San Francisco |
| 4. Los Angeles | 10. San Jose |
| 5. Oakland | 11. Stockton |
| 6. Sacramento | |

There are an additional **5 cities** that will be eligible according to definition (2):

- | | |
|--------------|-------------|
| 1. Compton | 4. Richmond |
| 2. Inglewood | 5. Vallejo |
| 3. Pomona | |

² The analysis of crime data was restricted to the 455 cities contained in both the California Department of Finance E-4 report (*Population Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, 2011-2021, with 2010 Benchmark*) and the Department of Justice’s Open Justice report (*Crimes and Clearances with Arson – 1985-2020*).

Some cities meet eligibility criteria under both definitions (1) and (2). All 16 cities are shown together in the table below:

	Cities	Definition (1)	Definition (2)
1	Bakersfield	X	X
2	Compton		X
3	Fresno	X	X
4	Inglewood		X
5	Long Beach	X	
6	Los Angeles	X	X
7	Oakland	X	X
8	Pomona		X
9	Richmond		X
10	Sacramento	X	X
11	San Bernardino	X	X
12	San Diego	X	
13	San Francisco	X	
14	San Jose	X	
15	Stockton	X	X
16	Vallejo		X

According to AB 1603, definitions (1), (2) and (3) must be considered equally. But what constitutes a “unique and compelling need?” It is up to this committee to decide what that means. It is not something that should be left to the discretion of each individual rater, as that would lend too much subjectivity to the rating process. Instead, the ESC must identify what criteria a city has to meet in order to demonstrate “a unique and compelling need for additional resources to address the impact of homicides, shootings, and aggravated assaults in the applicant’s community.”

Important Assumption:

Once the ESC agrees on objective criteria for definition (3), eligibility will be restricted to those cities (and CBOs that deliver services in those cities) that meet eligibility criteria under definition (1), (2) or (3). A list of these cities will be included in the RFP. Cities that do not appear on that list (and CBOs that deliver services in those cities) will not be eligible to apply.

To help guide this discussion, BSCC looked at how two other states use data to determine applicant priority. New York considers the following metrics in determining priority among applicants:

- Number of violent crimes involving guns/shootings
- Number of homicides
- Rate of violent crime

Massachusetts considers the following metrics in determining priority among applicants:

- Number of violent crimes
- Rate of violent crime

Guided by these models, BSCC's Research Division analyzed the crime data listed below, by both rate and number (these crimes were chosen because they are classified as Type I Violent Crimes by the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting System and are reported consistently by almost all law enforcement agencies in California):

- Homicide
- Robbery
- Aggravated Assault – Total
- Aggravated Assault – With a Firearm

The results of these analyses are available in a separate document.

3. ESC Decision Point. Discuss, consider and make decisions on the following:

The prior ESC defined a “unique and compelling need” as Cities experiencing seven (7) or more homicides during two or more of the three years prior to the grant application **and** had a homicide rate that was at least 25% higher than the statewide homicide rate during two or more of the three calendar years immediately preceding the grant application.

- | | |
|-------------|------------------|
| 1. Antioch | 5. Modesto |
| 2. Delano | 6. Moreno Valley |
| 3. Hemet | 7. Oxnard |
| 4. Hesperia | 8. Victorville |

Two additional options for how to define “unique and compelling need” are listed below:

Option 1. Cities that experienced 5 or more homicides during two or more of the three years prior to the grant application (note that we applied the same timeframe as appears in definitions (1) and (2)).

➔ This option would extend eligibility to an additional **37 cities**, listed here:

- | | |
|-------------------|----------------|
| 1. Anaheim | 5. Chula Vista |
| 2. Antioch | 6. Colton |
| 3. Carson | 7. Delano |
| 4. Cathedral City | 8. El Cajon |

9. El Monte
10. Fairfield
11. Fontana
12. Gardena
13. Hayward
14. Hemet
15. Hesperia
16. Jurupa Valley
17. Lancaster
18. Merced
19. Modesto
20. Moreno Valley
21. Norwalk
22. Ontario
23. Oxnard

24. Palm Springs
25. Palmdale
26. Pasadena
27. Perris
28. Rancho Cordova
29. Redlands
30. Rialto
31. Riverside
32. Salinas
33. Santa Ana
34. Santa Maria
35. Tracy
36. Turlock
37. Victorville

Option 2. Cities that experienced five (5) or more homicides during two or more of the three years prior to the grant application and represent/serve a city which falls within the top 5% of cities in California for average rates of Aggravated Assault with a Firearm over the three years preceding the grant application.

→ This option would narrow the pool, extending eligibility to only an additional **12 cities**, listed here:

- | | |
|--------------|-----------------|
| 1. Antioch | 7. Norwalk |
| 2. Carson | 8. Palm Springs |
| 3. Delano | 9. Palmdale |
| 4. Gardena | 10. Salinas |
| 5. Hesperia | 11. Santa Ana |
| 6. Lancaster | 12. Victorville |

Other options. Are there other options the group would like to consider?

NOTES:

4. Types of Strategies to be Funded

Perhaps the most important decision the ESC will make is determining which programs, strategies, models, etc. will be funded by this grant. Past ESCs have intentionally left RFP requirements broad, allowing applicants to select a strategy that works for their jurisdiction, as long as it was grounded in evidence and responsive to the needs the applicant articulated. Strategies currently funded by CalVIP include:

- Hospital-based Violence Intervention
- Cognitive Behavioral Therapy, Intensive Case Management, Employment/Job Training
- Street Outreach
- Homeless Violence Reduction Initiative
- Focused Deterrence, Ceasefire
- Gang Resistance Education and Training
- Re-Entry Assistance for Determined Youth Outreach ³

Allowing applicants to have broad discretion in selecting program models has benefits and drawbacks and it is important to consider these before deciding on how to structure the next CalVIP RFP. Some of the benefits include: applicants are not forced into a one-size-fits-all mold; applicants are allowed to select a strategy that works for their size, needs and capacity; and applicants have the freedom to be creative and innovative. But the drawbacks are concerning. BSCC now funds a variety of different strategies, making it difficult to measure outcomes in a systematic way; there is little consistency among grantees in terms of goals and objectives and corresponding data collection efforts; and some of the strategies being implemented are only loosely tied to a research-based model.

One of the questions that will be posed to this Committee in this paper is how best to address this issue. AB 1603 mandates that grantees use an evidence-based violence reduction strategy and provides three examples. It also leaves some discretion to the ESC to decide whether or not to allow other strategies to be used. The ESC could choose to restrict applicants to a “menu” of program strategies pre-determined by the ESC, to include at a minimum the strategies named in AB 1603. Alternatively, the ESC could allow applicants discretion in selecting an evidence-based strategy of their choosing, as long as they can demonstrate that it is evidence-based.

³ Re-Entry Assistance for Determined Youth (READY) is an evidence-based program that includes re-entry services including cognitive restructuring groups, case management, parenting classes, youth support and pro-social activities.

As mentioned above, AB 1603 narrows the focus of CalVIP funding to a select group of evidence-informed strategies. The bill states that CalVIP grants shall be used to support, expand, and replicate evidence-based violence reduction initiatives, including, without limitation:

- *Hospital-based violence intervention programs*
- *Evidence-based street outreach programs*
- *Focused deterrence strategies*

These initiatives shall “seek to interrupt cycles of violence and retaliation in order to reduce the incidence of homicides, shootings, and aggravated assaults.”

Descriptions and examples of the strategies named in AB 1603 are provided here:

- **Hospital-Based Violence Intervention Programs**

Hospital-based violence intervention programs (HVIPs) vary in the specifics of their design and scope, but typically include a brief intervention in the emergency department or at hospital bedside and post-discharge intensive community-based case management services. HVIP services are provided by culturally competent Violence Prevention Professionals who often also serve in a mentorship capacity. HVIPs are rooted in the philosophy that violence is preventable, and that violent injury offers a “teachable moment” and unique opportunity to break cycles of violence. HVIPs embrace a public health approach to violence prevention as they are grounded in data, which indicate that victims of violence are at elevated risk for re-injury and violence perpetration. This model has been the subject of numerous peer-reviewed studies indicating promising impact on injury recidivism, criminal justice contact, and trauma symptoms. HVIPs are now a recommended practice by the federal government.

(National Network of Hospital-based Violence Intervention Programs – www.nnhvip.org)

This strategy aims to (1) provide trained crisis intervention and long-term case management and mentoring home visits and follow-up assistance to youth who are hospitalized for violent injuries, on probation, or identified as being highly at risk for dropout or suspension from school, as well as to their family and friends; (2) prevent retaliatory violence and reduce the total number of youth injured by interpersonal violence; (3) reduce reentry into the hospital and the criminal justice system; (4) prevent dropout and suspension from school for violent incidents; (5) link youth with local resources that help them live nonviolent lifestyles; and (6) provide positive peer role models and promote positive alternatives to violence.

- **Evidence-Based Street Outreach Programs**

Street outreach occurs inside the framework of a cooperative relationship with other agencies, including probation, law enforcement, social services, and schools. Outreach workers are referred to as “street” outreach workers because their work is not office-based or even institutional- or school-based, but occurs

primarily in the targeted neighborhoods, at the street and home level.

Cure Violence is an example of a street outreach model that is used around the country. The Cure Violence model was developed in 1995 by the Chicago Project for Violence Prevention, under the auspices of the University of Illinois at Chicago's School of Public Health. Cure Violence takes a public health approach to stopping shootings and killings, focusing on interrupting violence and the transmission of norms that promote it.

Using a multi-pronged approach to prevent shootings involving youth and young adults from ages 14-25, the model relies on the use of culturally appropriate staff who respond to shootings to prevent retaliation and detect and resolve conflicts that are likely to lead to shootings. They develop relationships with high-risk individuals who are likely to engage in gun violence and link them with resources such as education and job training. Staff collaborates with neighborhood organizations and other community groups to organize neighborhood events and public education activities that promote a no-shooting message. The strategy aims to change behaviors, attitudes, and social norms directly related to gun violence.

(from SNUG RFP, NYS DCJS, 2019)

- **Focused Deterrence Strategies**

Practice Goals. Focused deterrence strategies (also referred to as "pulling levers" policing) are problem-oriented policing strategies that follow the core principles of deterrence theory. The strategies target specific criminal behavior committed by a small number of chronic offenders who are vulnerable to sanctions and punishment. Offenders are directly confronted and informed that continued criminal behavior will not be tolerated. Targeted offenders are also told how the criminal justice system (such as the police and prosecutors) will respond to continued criminal behavior; mainly that all potential sanctions, or levers, will be applied. The deterrence-based message is reinforced through crackdowns on offenders, or groups of offenders (such as gang members), who continue to commit crimes despite the warning. In addition to deterring violent behavior, the strategies also reward compliance and nonviolent behavior among targeted offenders by providing positive incentives, such as access to social services and job opportunities.

Target Population. Focused deterrence strategies generally target a specific type or group of offenders, such as youth gang members or repeat violent offenders. Many focused deterrence interventions have primarily targeted incidents of homicide and serious violence (criminal activities that usually involve chronic offenders) in urban settings (Kennedy 2006). Some strategies have focused on eliminating public forms of drug dealing (such as street markets and crack houses). These strategies are known as drug market interventions and they work by warning dealers, buyers, and their families that enforcement is imminent.

Practice Components. The focused deterrence framework was developed in Boston during the 1990s. Operation Ceasefire (Boston) was a problem-oriented policing project to stop serious gang violence by directly communicating to gang members that violence would no longer be tolerated and backing up that message

by “pulling every lever” legally available when violence occurred. At the same time, youth workers, probation and parole officers, and other community-based organizations offered services and resources to gang members.

At a general level, the approach of focused deterrence strategies includes the following:

1. Selecting a particular crime problem (such as youth homicide);
2. Convening an interagency working group that may include law enforcement, social service, and community-based practitioners;
3. Developing a response to offenders or groups of offenders that uses a variety of sanctions (“pulling levers”) to stop continued violent behavior;
4. Focusing social services and community resources on target offenders to match the prevention efforts by law enforcement; and
5. Directly and continually communicating with offenders to make them understand why they are receiving special attention.

(www.crimesolutions.gov)

BSCC interprets the “*without limitation*” in AB 1603 to mean “*including, but not limited to,*” therefore the language allows for strategies other than those listed above to be funded, as long as they meet the other criteria laid out in the statute, which will be discussed later in this paper.

4a. ESC Decision Point. Discuss, consider and make decisions on the following:

Beyond the three strategies named in the legislation:

- Should applicants be allowed discretion in selecting an evidence-based strategy, as long as they can demonstrate that it is evidence-based? (The Committee can decide what that would look like later on.)
- Should applicants be restricted to a “menu” of program strategies, starting with the three listed in AB 1603? What other violence reduction strategies would be included on that menu?

Should we incentivize the use of the three strategies listed in AB 1603? For example:

- Applicants that select one of the three strategies listed in AB 1603 receive preference points; or
- Applicants that select one of the three strategies listed in AB 1603 receive free-of-charge technical assistance from an outside provider.

Strategy-specific requirements.

Once the ESC decides on which strategies are eligible for funding, it may want to consider whether to include specific requirements, or criteria an applicant must meet, specific to the selected strategy. For example, for the three strategies named in the proposal, requirements might look like this:

- **Hospital-Based Violence Intervention Programs**
 - Applicants must have LOA or MOU from at least one hospital or trauma center indicating their intent to partner on the grant.
 - Others?
- **Evidence-Based Street Outreach Programs**
 - Applicants must have LOA or MOU from its local law enforcement agency indicating their intent to support the grant.
 - Others?
- **Focused Deterrence Strategies**
 - Applicants must have LOA or MOU from its local law enforcement agency as well as mayor or city manager, indicating their intent to support the grant.
 - Applicants must have LOA or MOU from one or more community-based organizations, indicating their intent to support the grant.
 - Others?

Requirements for all proposals.

AB 1603 sets certain criteria for what an applicant must include as part of a proposal, regardless of the strategy they select. These include:

- (1) Clearly defined and measurable objectives for the grant.
- (2) A statement describing how the applicant proposes to use the grant to implement an evidence-based violence reduction initiative in accordance with this section.
- (3) A statement describing how the applicant proposes to use the grant to enhance coordination of existing violence prevention and intervention programs and minimize duplication of services.
- (4) Evidence indicating that the proposed violence reduction initiative would likely reduce the incidence of homicides, shootings, and aggravated assaults.

4b. ESC Decision Point. Discuss, consider and make decisions on the following:

How does an applicant demonstrate that the strategy they have selected is evidence-based? Is the group okay with using a term like “evidence-informed” or “principles of evidence-based practice?” That is, is it sufficient if an applicant can demonstrate that:

- The strategy is grounded in some kind of evidence
- They have completed a problem analysis
- They have developed an implementation plan
- They have a plan to collect data and measure impact

Are there any other requirements or criteria that should be included? For example:

- Describe the steps you took to identify the proposed strategy as a solution to an identified problem.
- Cite the sources or references that show the strategy to be evidence-based.
- Explain why you think this strategy will work in your jurisdiction.
- Describe your plan for staffing and implementation of the strategy.
- Describe how you plan to demonstrate that the strategy is being carried out as intended.
- Others?

Proposals with the “greatest likelihood” of reducing violence “without contributing to mass incarceration.”

AB 1603 requires that the Board give preference to applicants whose grant proposals demonstrate the greatest likelihood of reducing the incidence of homicides, shootings and aggravated assaults in the applicant’s community, without contributing to mass

incarceration. AB 1603 already requires that grantees use an evidence-based violence reduction strategy; what else should we be looking for here?

There are a few ways in which to address this requirement. In lieu of assigning actual preference points, the ESC could instead structure the rating criteria in such a way that certain types of strategies receive a higher rating. Another way to address this might be to consider this more as an “exclusionary” criterion than a way to gain “preference.” For example, applicants that propose to use strategies that reduce violence in the short-term, but actually lead to increased incarceration receive a lower rating.

Research has shown that certain strategies either do not have a positive impact on violence reduction or, in some cases, increase the likelihood of recidivism. Making these types of strategies ineligible for CalVIP funding, would address the AB 1603 requirement listed above. Strategies that could be considered for the “**ineligible**” list might include:

- “Scared Straight” programs
- Place-Based Policing
- “Stop and Frisk” Policing
- Others?

4c. ESC Decision Point. Discuss, consider and make decisions on the following:

Should there be a list of programs or strategies named in the RFP that are ineligible for CalVIP funding?

- If so, what should be included on that list?
- Are there any other expenditures the ESC believes should not be eligible for CalVIP funding?

NOTES:

5. Other Applicant Criteria

Administrative criteria for CBO applicants.

BSCC already requires that all non-governmental organizations (NGOs) meet certain criteria in order to receive BSCC grant funds. These criteria were developed so that BSCC had assurance that the non-governmental entities receiving grant funds – either as a grantee or a sub-grantee – had the required certifications, licenses, and experience to provide the services. The language shown below appears in all RFPs issued by the BSCC:

Criteria for NGOs Receiving BSCC Grant Funds.

Any non-governmental organization (NGO) that receives CalVIP grant funds or commits match funds to the project must:

- Have been duly organized, in existence, and in good standing for a minimum of six months prior to the release of the RFP;
- Be registered with the California Secretary of State's Office, if applicable;
- Have a valid business license, Employer Identification Number (EIN), and/or Taxpayer ID (if sole proprietorship);
- Have any other state or local licenses or certifications necessary to provide the services requested (e.g., facility licensing by the Department of Health Care Services), if applicable.
- Have a physical address.

In addition to the administrative criteria listed above, any non-governmental organization that receives CalVIP grant funds must have a proven track in providing the service(s) for which they are receiving the funds.

5a. ESC Decision Point. Discuss, consider and make decisions on the following:

In addition to BSCC's standard criteria, are there other requirements that should be included? For example:

- Have 501(c)(3) status?
- Have a certain number of years of experience providing the named strategy?
- Others?

How many applications can a CBO be party to?

Under the current CalVIP grant structure, a CBO could apply directly AND be party to a separate application from a city, as a part of that city's required 50 percent pass-through. This presents a difficult situation. On the one hand, allowing CBOs to hold more than one agreement involving CalVIP funds leaves room for confusion and duplication of services (whether intended or unintended). On the other hand, many cities are not able to identify their CBO partners until after they are awarded the grant, due to the rules of competitive bidding. In this case, if a CBO did not apply based on a tentative agreement with a city but then that agreement did not materialize, that CBO would have missed its opportunity for funding.

5b. ESC Decision Point. Discuss, consider and make decisions on the following:

Should CBOs be allowed to apply as a direct recipient and as a sub-recipient on a city's application?

- If the answer is yes, should there be a limit to the number of times a CBO can appear as a sub-recipient (e.g. no more than two times)?
- Should a CBO be required to demonstrate how the projects are different and unique? What would this look like?

6. Funding Considerations

Funding caps on individual awards.

Statutory language sets the maximum award at \$2 million per year. It is important to note that this is the maximum award. The ESC may choose to allow all applicants to apply for the maximum amount, or within the \$6 million ceiling, the ESC may choose to set graduated caps for smaller projects, etc. Or the ESC may choose to set different funding caps for cities and CBOs, taking into consideration that 50 percent of a city's award will pass through to one or more CBOs. None of these decisions alleviate an applicant's responsibility to provide a compelling case for the amount requested.

6a. ESC Decision Point. Discuss, consider and make decisions on the following:

Reminder, there is a 100% match for all grantees.

How should individual award caps be structured? For example:

Example 1. Allow all applicants (cities and CBOs) to apply for the maximum, up to \$6 million.

Example 2. Allow an applicant to determine whether they want to apply as a Large, Medium or Small Scope Project. For example, Large Scope Projects may apply for up to \$6 million, Medium Scope Projects may apply for up to \$3 million and Small Scope Projects up to \$1.5 million.

Example 3. Set one cap for city applicants and another cap for CBO applicants. For example, cities can apply for up to \$6 million (with \$3 million passing through to CBOs and other public agencies) and CBOs on their own can apply for up to \$3 or \$4 million.

Other Options. Ideas from the ESC?

How many grants might be funded using the different examples? Note: these distributions are dependent on how the ESC chooses to divide up the available funds. The following tables are provided for discussion purposes only.

Example 1.

Categories	Individual Funding Caps	Funding Available	Total Number Grants Funded
City of Los Angeles	n/a	\$6,000,000	1
All Other Applicants	\$6,000,000	\$209,900,000	35
Totals:		\$215,900,000	36

Example 2.

Categories	Individual Funding Caps	Funding Available	Total Number of Grants Funded
City of Los Angeles	n/a	\$6,000,000	1
Small Scope Projects	\$1,500,000	\$69,966,667	47
Medium Scope Projects	\$3,000,000	\$69,966,667	23
Large Scope Projects	\$6,000,000	\$69,966,667	12
Totals:		\$215,900,000	83

Example 3a.

Categories	Individual Funding Caps	Funding Available	Total Number of Grants Funded
City of Los Angeles	n/a	\$6,000,000	1
CBOs	\$3,000,000	\$104,950,000	35
Cities	\$6,000,000	\$104,950,000	17
Totals:		\$215,900,000	53

Example 3b.

Categories	Individual Funding Caps	Funding Available	Total Number of Grants Funded
City of Los Angeles	n/a	\$6,000,000	1
CBOs	\$4,000,000	\$104,950,000	26
Cities	\$6,000,000	\$104,950,000	17
Totals:		\$215,900,000	45

Funding allotments.

Recognizing that different-sized jurisdictions have different capacities, resources and needs, some ESCs have decided to allocate separate funding allotments or “set-asides” for various purposes. Remember that there is \$209,900,000 available for competitive grants.

6b. ESC Decision Point. Discuss, consider and make decisions on the following:

How should the \$209,900,000 million be divided up, if at all? Should the funds be split into different categories? For example:

Example 1: Make the entire \$209 million available to all applicants. All applicants compete equally for the funds, regardless of whether a city or CBO. With this option, there is no guarantee that there would be an equal distribution of grants among cities or CBOs. Awards would be determined by score alone. Depending on how the scores fall out, a larger portion of the grant money could go to CBOs, or vice versa, to cities.

Example 2: Split the \$209 million evenly between cities and CBOs. This means that cities will compete against other cities and CBOs will compete against other CBOs. This scenario ensures that a fairly equal number of cities and CBOs will be funded.

<i>Funding Category</i>	<i>Funds Available</i>	<i>Split</i>
Cities	\$104,950,000	50%
CBOs	\$104,950,000	50%
Total	\$209,900,000	100%

Example 3: Divide the \$209 million between cities and CBOs with 40% available for cities and 60% available to CBOs. This means that cities will compete against other cities for 40% of the funding and CBOs will compete against other CBOs for 60% of the funding.

<i>Funding Category</i>	<i>Funds Available</i>	<i>Split</i>
Cities	\$83,960,000	40%
CBOs	\$125,940,000	60%
Total	\$209,900,000	100%

Example 4: Projects of a similar scope compete against each other. For example, applicants with a smaller project scope and a smaller funding request compete against other smaller scope projects. Similarly, applicants with a larger project scope, and therefore larger funding request, compete against projects of a larger scope. In this scenario, applicants would self-select a funding category

Funding Category	Funds Available	Split
Large Scope Projects	\$94,455,000	45%
Medium Scope Projects	\$62,970,000	30%
Small Scope Projects	\$52,475,000	25%
Total	\$209,900,000	100%

Example 5: Set-aside funds for certain strategies to ensure that they are funded?

Type of Strategy	Funds Available	Split
<i>Named in AB 1603:</i>		
• Hospital-Based Violence Intervention	\$52,475,000	75%
• Evidence-Based Street Outreach	\$52,475,000	
• Focused Deterrence	\$52,475,000	
<i>Evidence-Based Strategies not named in AB 1603:</i>	\$52,475,000	25%
Total	\$209,900,000	100%

Other Examples. Other ideas from the ESC?

NOTES:

7. Grant Application Budget Considerations

Typical BSCC budget categories for invoicing are listed below. While recognizing agencies may use different line items in the budget process, the line items below represent how the BSCC will require grantees to report expenditures via its invoicing system. The CalVIP ESC may choose to add and/or subtract categories from this list, as needed.

- Salaries and Benefits
- Services and Supplies
- Professional Services
- Non-Governmental Organization Contracts
- Indirect Costs/Administrative Overhead
- Fixed Assets/Equipment
- Data Collection/Enhancement of Data Collection Systems
- Project Evaluation
- Sustainability Planning
- Other (includes travel and training costs)

Historically, if the ESC has determined a particular effort is necessary for the success of the grant projects, a percentage of the total contract award may be required within the RFP budget section (e.g., applicants must allocate a minimum of 15% of the total grant award requested for Project Evaluation). Precedence has been established for setting specific grant-funded percentages for categories such as:

- Data Collection and Enhancement efforts, including building capacity & infrastructure
- Project Evaluation
- Sustainability Planning

In addition, ESCs have directed a maximum dollar amount or percentage of funds to be spent in any one budget category (e.g., no more than 10% of total grant award requested may be allocated in the Project Evaluation category).

7. ESC Decision Points. Discuss, consider and make decisions on the following:

7a. What level of budget information should be required within the RFP?

7b. Should the RFP require applicants to spend a designated percentage of the grant funds or assign a specific dollar amount to certain efforts (i.e., budget categories)?

7c. If the ESC chooses to require funding percentages (either minimum or maximums):

- In which categories would this apply?
- What percentages would be expected in the identified budget categories?

7d. Does the ESC want to limit the percentage or dollar amount used in any particular budget categories?

- If so, how much and in which categories?

NOTES

8. Evaluation Requirements

Performance measurement versus program evaluation.

According to Thomas Abt⁴, “Performance measurement and program evaluation are essential to keep anti-violence efforts on track. Both help determine whether an effort, in part or as a whole, is achieving its goals, and they can identify areas in need of improvement. They serve different but complementary functions: performance measurement is an ongoing process that monitors progress using shared measures or metrics, while program evaluation uses rigorous research methods to answer specific questions about whether a program is achieving its goals. Performance measures outputs, or whether people are doing what they are supposed to be doing. Evaluation measures outcomes, or whether what they are doing is achieving the intended results.”

All BSCC grantees are required to monitor performance through the submission of quarterly progress reports. To ensure that projects funded by the BSCC can be evaluated, BSCC typically requires applicants to describe up front their plan for evaluating a proposed project, to include goals and objectives, plans for data collection, process measures, and outcome measures, etc. Once a grant is awarded, grantees are required to submit a formal Local Evaluation Plan (LEP). Evaluation plans will provide details on how the grantee will evaluate grant-funded activities. At the conclusion of the grant, grantees are required to submit a Final Evaluation Report (LER).

Grantees have the option of using grant dollars or match dollars (or a combination) to fund these efforts. In the past, some ESCs have also established a minimum dollar amount that grantees must dedicate to their data collection evaluation efforts.

This amount can be dependent on the size and scope of the grant project. Some ESCs choose to set the threshold based on a percentage of the total grant or total project value. Some examples from past RFPs include:

- **Prop. 47** (\$6 million funding threshold): *Applicants must dedicate a minimum of 5 percent (or \$25,000, whichever amount is greater) up to a maximum of 10 percent of total grant funds requested to this line item.*
- **CalVIP**: *No minimum funding amount set.*
- **Youth Reinvestment Grant**: *No minimum funding amount set.*

Outside versus in-house evaluators.

Past ESCs have also decided whether to require grantees to hire an outside evaluator or allow them to complete their evaluations with in-house resources. Some cities and CBOs

⁴ Abt, Thomas. *Bleeding Out: The Devastating Consequences of Urban Violence – And a Bold New Plan for Peace in the Streets*. Basic Books, New York. 2019.

have dedicated research and evaluation divisions whose primary function is program monitoring and evaluation. One possible option is to allow grantees to use their in-house evaluation team for performance management and data collection but require them to work with an outside evaluator for the final program evaluation. Both efforts could be counted toward any minimum dollar threshold that is set.

Note: Potential for outside evaluation assistance.

BSCC is considering using a portion of its administrative funds to enter into an agreement with a public university for assistance with the coordination and implementation of evaluation efforts. If this plan comes to fruition, CalVIP applicants must agree to work with BSCC's contractor on these efforts. These evaluation efforts would focus on the CalVIP program as a whole, at the state level and not intended to replace the individual project's specific goals.

8. ESC Decision Points. Discuss, consider and make decisions on the following:

8a. Should grantees be required to allocate a minimum or maximum amount of funds toward their data collection and evaluation efforts?

- If so, what should those limits be?

8b. Are there any specific performance measurement or project evaluation requirements the ESC would like to set for CalVIP grantees?

- If so, what are they?

8c. Should grantees be required to use an outside evaluator? Can the evaluator be a private firm or a public or private university?

NOTES:

9. RFP Logistics

The selection process for this funding is a competitive process and proposals will be rated by a merit review to determine which applicant best meets the intent and the requirements of this initiative.

As a part of all competitive grant processes, the BSCC staff typically review materials submitted by the applicants to determine whether they meet the RFP requirements.

The BSCC routinely reviews the following items as a part of a technical review process:

- Proposal meets all format requirements including page limitations as determined by the ESC.
- Proposal contains all required sections.
- Proposal contains all required signatures.

If time permits, the ESC should discuss the general guideline options listed below; however, final determination of narrative sections, page limits, and attachments may need to occur at the October 22nd meeting at the discussion of proposal rating factors and criteria.

9. ESC Decision Points. Discuss, consider and make decisions on the following:

9a. What sections or items should be included in the Grant Application?

Examples of prior RFP section decisions are listed below; however, given the uniqueness of the CalVIP Grant Program, the ESC may determine the need for different or fewer sections:

Examples only:

- Abstract
- Project Need / Problem Analysis
- Project Description
- Goal and Objectives
- Collaboration
- Evaluation
- Budget Table
- Budget Narrative
- Workplan
- Project Timeline
- Letters of Commitment
- Letters of Collaboration

9b. When determining the RFP narrative sections, should page limits and limits on attachments be imposed?

- If so, what types of attachments would the ESC like to see from applicants? Examples could include:
 - 1-page Bibliography: To allow applicants to cite data sources without using up precious space in the Proposal Narrative.
 - Letters of Commitment: Consider requiring applicants to submit Letters of Agreement for all Community Partners and/or members of the Coordinating and Advisory Council.
 - Letters of Commitment: Consider a page limit for letters of commitment not to exceed two total pages per letter. Consider a timeframe for letters of commitment (e.g., letters must be dated within 3 months of proposal submission date).
 - Work Plan: Consider requiring applicants to use a work plan. A work plan outlines goals and objectives, timelines, and identifies the necessary processes and responsible parties to accomplish goals.

9c. To ensure a reasonable way for Committee members to read and rate all of the proposals within a finite timeline, the ESC should consider limiting the number of pages applicants can submit while still ensuring sufficient information is provided to score based on the rating factors. Typically, it is recommended an application take no more than 1.5 hours to read and rate.

Examples of prior RFP section decisions:

- 1) 11-page limit:
 - *Abstract 1 page*
 - Project Need – 2 pages
 - Project Description – 4 pages
 - Budget Table - 1
 - Budget Narrative – 3 pages
 - Workplan – 1 page
- 2) 12-page limit plus Budget Narrative:
 - *Abstract 1 page*
 - Project Need – 3 pages
 - Project Description – 7 pages
 - Budget Table – 1
 - *Budget Narrative – no limit but within specific framework of RFP
 - Workplan – 1 page

3) 18-page limit:

- *Abstract 1 page*
- Project Need and Project Description – 12 total pages
- Budget Table – 1
- Budget Narrative – 3 pages
- Workplan – 2 pages

Italicized bullets are not typically scored or rated but used for clarification purposes.

State Budget Act 2021-22
Senate Bill No. 129
Chapter 69

5227-108-0001—For local assistance, Board of State and Community Corrections

Schedule:

(1) 4945-Corrections Planning and Grant Programs	76,000,000
(a) Grants to the City of Los Angeles	(2,000,000)
(b) Competitive grants to all other cities or community-based organizations	(74,000,000)

Provisions:

1. The Board of State and Community Corrections program awarding state grant funds from subdivisions (a) and (b) of Schedule (1) shall be named the California Violence Intervention and Prevention Grant Program (CalVIP). The board shall administer CalVIP in accordance with the Breaking the Cycle of Violence Act (Title 10.2 (commencing with Section 14130) of Part 4 of the Penal Code), subject to the following:
 - (a) The amount appropriated in subdivision (b) of Schedule (1) shall be for competitive grants in a three-year grant cycle to cities or community-based organizations. Notwithstanding paragraph (1) of subdivision (h) of Section 14131 of the Penal Code, a grant shall not exceed \$2,000,000 per year, and at least two grants shall be awarded to cities with populations of 200,000 or less.
 - (b) All CalVIP grantees shall be required to provide a cash or in-kind contribution equal to 100 percent of the state grant funds awarded for this item.
2. Funds appropriated in this item are available for encumbrance and expenditures until June 30, 2026.
3. Upon order of the Director of Finance, up to 5 percent of the amount appropriated in Schedule (1) shall be transferred to Scheduled (1) of Item 5227-001-0001 for costs to administer and support CalVIP. The board may use up to \$2,000,000 of those funds for costs of administering CalVIP and may, with the advice and assistance of the CalVIP grant selection advisory committee pursuant to subdivision (k) of Section 14131 of the Penal Code, use remaining funds under this provision to promote CalVIP and build capacity in the field of community-based violence intervention and prevention. Promotion includes activities such as contracting with or hiring technical assistance providers with experience in implementing community-based violence intervention and prevention programs, contracting with or providing grants to organizations that provide training and certification to community-based violence intervention and prevention

professionals to expand the field of frontline workers and technical assistance providers, and contracting with independent researchers to evaluate the impact of selected initiatives supported by CalVIP. Funds transferred pursuant to this provision are available for encumbrance and expenditure until June 30, 2026.

Assembly Bill No. 1603
CHAPTER
735

An act to add and repeal Title 10.2 (commencing with Section 14130) of Part 4 of the Penal Code, relating to criminal justice.

[Approved by Governor October 11, 2019. Filed with Secretary of State October 11, 2019.]

AB 1603, Wicks. California Violence Intervention and Prevention Grant Program.

Existing law establishes the Board of State and Community Corrections. Existing law charges the board with providing the statewide leadership, coordination, and technical assistance to promote effective state and local efforts and partnerships in California's adult and juvenile criminal justice system, including addressing gang problems.

The existing Budget Act of 2019 establishes the California Violence Intervention and Prevention Grant Program, administered by the Board of State and Community Corrections, to award competitive grants for the purpose of violence intervention and prevention. The Budget Act of 2019 limits the amount of each grant to a maximum of \$500,000.

This bill would codify the establishment of the California Violence Intervention and Prevention Grant Program and the authority and duties of the board in administering the program, including the selection criteria for grants and reporting requirements to the Legislature. The bill would increase the maximum grant amount to \$1,500,000. This bill would repeal this program on January 1, 2025.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Title 10.2 (commencing with Section 14130) is added to Part 4 of the Penal Code, to read:

TITLE 10.2. CALIFORNIA VIOLENCE INTERVENTION AND PREVENTION GRANT PROGRAM

14130. This title shall be known and may be cited as the Break the Cycle of Violence Act.

14131. (a) The California Violence Intervention and Prevention Grant Program (CalVIP) is hereby created to be administered by the Board of State and Community Corrections.

Ch. 735

(b) The purpose of CalVIP is to improve public health and safety by supporting effective violence reduction initiatives in communities that are disproportionately impacted by violence, particularly group-member involved homicides, shootings, and aggravated assaults.

(c) CalVIP grants shall be used to support, expand, and replicate evidence-based violence reduction initiatives, including, without limitation, hospital-based violence intervention programs, evidence-based street outreach programs, and focused deterrence strategies, that seek to interrupt cycles of violence and retaliation in order to reduce the incidence of homicides, shootings, and aggravated assaults. These initiatives shall be primarily focused on providing violence intervention services to the small segment of the population that is identified as having the highest risk of perpetrating or being victimized by violence in the near future.

(d) CalVIP grants shall be made on a competitive basis to cities that are disproportionately impacted by violence, and to community-based organizations that serve the residents of those cities.

(e) For purposes of this section, a city is disproportionately impacted by violence if any of the following are true:

(1) The city experienced 20 or more homicides per calendar year during two or more of the three calendar years immediately preceding the grant application for which the Department of Justice has available data.

(2) The city experienced 10 or more homicides per calendar year and had a homicide rate that was at least 50 percent higher than the statewide homicide rate during two or more of the three calendar years immediately preceding the grant application for which the Department of Justice has available data.

(3) An applicant otherwise demonstrates a unique and compelling need for additional resources to address the impact of homicides, shootings, and aggravated assaults in the applicant's community.

(f) An applicant for a CalVIP grant shall submit a proposal, in a form prescribed by the board, which shall include, but not be limited to, all of the following:

(1) Clearly defined and measurable objectives for the grant.

(2) A statement describing how the applicant proposes to use the grant to implement an evidence-based violence reduction initiative in accordance with this section.

(3) A statement describing how the applicant proposes to use the grant to enhance coordination of existing violence prevention and intervention programs and minimize duplication of services.

(4) Evidence indicating that the proposed violence reduction initiative would likely reduce the incidence of homicides, shootings, and aggravated assaults.

(g) In awarding CalVIP grants, the board shall give preference to applicants whose grant proposals demonstrate the greatest likelihood of reducing the incidence of homicides, shootings, and aggravated assaults in the applicant's community, without contributing to mass incarceration.

(h) The amount of funds awarded to an applicant shall be commensurate with the scope of the applicant's proposal and the applicant's demonstrated need for additional resources to address violence in the applicant's community.

(1) Notwithstanding Provision 3 of Item 5227-108-0001 of Section 2.00 of the Budget Act of 2019 (Chapter 23 of the Statutes of 2019), the Board of State and Community Corrections may award competitive grants in amounts not to exceed one million five hundred thousand dollars (\$1,500,000) per applicant per grant cycle. The length of the grant cycle shall be determined by the board.

(2) The board shall award at least two grants to cities with populations of 200,000 or less.

(i) Each grantee shall commit a cash or in-kind contribution equivalent to the amount of the grant awarded under this section.

(j) Each city that receives a CalVIP grant shall distribute no less than 50 percent of the grant funds to one or more of any of the following types of entities:

(1) Community-based organizations.

(2) Public agencies or departments, other than law enforcement agencies or departments, that are primarily dedicated to community safety or violence prevention.

(k) The board shall form a grant selection advisory committee including, without limitation, persons who have been impacted by violence, formerly incarcerated persons, and persons with direct experience in implementing evidence-based violence reduction initiatives, including initiatives that incorporate public health and community-based approaches.

(l) The board may use up to 5 percent of the funds appropriated for CalVIP each year for the costs of administering the program including, without limitation, the employment of personnel, providing technical assistance to grantees, and evaluation of violence reduction initiatives supported by CalVIP.

(m) Each grantee shall report to the board, in a form and at intervals prescribed by the board, their progress in achieving the grant objectives.

(n) The board shall, by no later than 90 days following the close of each grant cycle, prepare and submit a report to the Legislature in compliance with Section 9795 of the Government Code regarding the impact of the violence prevention initiatives supported by CalVIP.

(o) The board shall make evaluations of the grant program available to the public.

14132. This title shall remain in effect only until January 1, 2025, and as of that date is repealed.