

PHASE I DUE DILIGENCE REPORT:
FEDERAL FUNDING STREAMS AND
SUBGRANTEE ACTIVITIES ADMINISTERED BY
THE INDIANA CRIMINAL JUSTICE INSTITUTE,
2003-05

Samuel Nunn
Kenna Quinet

Appendix II compiled by
Dona Sapp



© 2006 Center for Urban Policy and the Environment 06-C04
342 North Senate Avenue, 3rd Floor
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-1708



PHASE I DUE DILIGENCE REPORT: FEDERAL FUNDING STREAMS AND SUBGRANTEE ACTIVITIES ADMINISTERED BY THE INDIANA CRIMINAL JUSTICE INSTITUTE, 2003-05

February 2006

06-C04

Authors	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
Samuel Nunn	INTRODUCTION.....	5
Kenna Quinet	OVERVIEW OF FUNDING STREAMS AND FUND DELIVERY	7
	The Role of the ICJI Board in Funding Decisions	10
	OVERVIEW OF SERVICE DELIVERY	11
	Drug and Crime Control (DCC)	11
	Victim Services (VS)	14
	Youth Services (YS).....	15
	ANALYSIS OF ICJI FUNDING STREAMS	19
	APPENDIX I: SUMMARY OF PHASE I TASKS TO BE PERFORMED BY THE CENTER.....	24
	APPENDIX II: OVERVIEW OF STATE STATISTICAL ANALYSIS CENTERS.....	25
	Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority.....	25
	Research and Evaluation -- Publications by Topic	26
	Ohio Office of Criminal Justice Services.....	27
	Michigan Justice Statistics Center	27
	Center for Analysis of Crime Statistics (Nevada).....	28
	APPENDIX III: PRELIMINARY SCHEDULE FOR FUNDING STREAM ASSESSMENTS.....	29



Index of Tables

Table 1. Indiana Criminal Justice Institute (ICJI) operating budget, as passed April 29, 2005	7
Table 2. ICJI Grant Applications Dates	9
Table 3. Drug and Crime Control Major Program Funding	12
Table 4. Victim Services Major Program Funding.....	14
Table 5. Youth Services Division Major Program Funding.....	16
Table 6. Summary of Division Breakdowns.....	19



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In summer 2005, the Office of the Governor and the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute (ICJI) entered into a contract with IUPUI's Center for Urban Policy and the Environment (Center) for the conduct of a due diligence examination of the federal programs administered within the Drug and Crime Control, Victim Services, and Youth Services divisions. The Center developed a profile of ICJI activities to help shape a future assessment of its major program areas. This report presents results of this descriptive overview. It looks at grant funding streams, subgrantees, and other performance issues linked to financing statewide criminal justice programs through the federal and state grants administered by ICJI.

ICJI grant programs are administered within the agency's larger budgetary environment. The as-passed Indiana state budget for fiscal years 2006 and 2007 allocated \$60.7 million each year to the operations of ICJI. Within this budget, the state established approximately 84 account numbers linked to ICJI operations. Approximately \$52.4 million is allocated each year to about 69 line item accounts for all four ICJI operating divisions (see Table 1).

The Center examined the annual allocation of federal and state grant awards in 11 major funding streams administered by ICJI in three of its operating divisions: Drug and Crime Control (see Table 3), Victim Services (see Table 4), and Youth Services (see Table 5).¹ The examination of funding streams was based on data supplied by ICJI staff for the years 2003, 2004, and 2005. In 2004, ICJI administered \$24.4 million in primarily federal grant awards to 650 subgrantees across the state, averaging about \$37,500 per grant (see Table 6).

In exchange for the program awards, most subgrantees provide performance information in some form. There have been few analyses of whether performance statistics are linked to grant awards. Victim Services subgrantees submit reports that are stored in federal data repositories in the U.S. Department of Justice. Multi-jurisdictional drug task forces submit detailed reports to ICJI on arrests, convictions, task force composition, assets seized and forfeited, expenditures, and other measures. Performance reporting by other subgrantee groups is harder to find (e.g., criminal history records information grants). The state's courts and corrections systems also deliver ICJI-funded services (e.g., drug courts, substance abuse programs), but performance reporting is inconsistent. Youth Services has the largest number of subgrantees and it is not clear how these agencies report their progress. Juvenile programs are implemented in many different organizational settings including schools, prosecutor's offices, courts, county governments, county commissioners, and other state agencies.

In 2004, ICJI administered eleven different (but often related) criminal justice programs among 650 subgrantees. Profiling a "typical" subgrantee is difficult because there is such diversity in agencies and objectives. An overview of ICJI subgrantees from 2003 to 2005 offers insights into future funding performance, because subgrantees will vary according to several factors:

- Varied missions (e.g., crime control, drug enforcement, incarceration, court systems, fighting juvenile delinquency, etc.)
- Different organizational settings (e.g., sheriff's office, municipal police department, state corrections institution, nonprofit service providers, parole and probation offices, multi-jurisdictional task forces, and specialized courts)

¹ One additional funding stream, Criminal History Records Information Systems, is created as a percentage of Byrne/JAG programs, and is examined in this report as well.



- Different governmental units (e.g., towns, cities, counties, state agencies)
- Frequent public/nonprofit and public/private partners in the funding arrangements (e.g., Department of Corrections and a substance abuse treatment center, prosecutor's office and nonprofit victims services agency)
- Frequent collaborations among criminal justice agencies (e.g., prosecutor's offices and drug courts, MJTFs)

In 2006 and 2007, the ICJI must decide how to allocate a declining share of funds from federal grant sources, and so should think strategically about how to invest its criminal justice program spending wisely. To this end, the range of JAG priorities is to be narrowed to six areas. Also, in a January 25, 2006, draft of Victim Services priorities for 2006-07, nine program priorities are identified, in some cases by identifying specific programs operating within the state (MADD, Indiana Coalition Against Domestic Violence, and Indiana Coalition Against Sexual Assault).²

After priorities are identified, there will still be decisions about funding 2006-07 programs. Performance based grant awards are clearly possible, but will require substantial work to measure. Assessing performance of subgrantees will be a challenging affair. ICJI research staff and the Center will need to confront several factors likely to affect performance questions:

1. The missions of these various organizations have wide variety, and will call for different kinds of output and outcome measures.
2. Subgrantee performance reporting varies considerably, including different operating metrics within the same funding streams.
3. Each stream is composed of grant recipients representing different organizational environments.
4. ICJI sometimes administers its own service delivery program, meaning in effect that ICJI makes grants to itself. ICJI sometimes funds direct service delivery programs from grants it has been awarded by the Board of Trustees (e.g., funds for research projects at Universities) and ICJI must manage the federally-mandated set aside of 5 percent of all Byrne/JAG monies for the CHRIS program. Some thought should be directed at how to evaluate the performance of these internally-funded programs.
5. The comparative sizes of ICJI grants vary widely around an average of approximately \$37,000—from about \$14,000 to more than \$314,000. The largest grants are more than \$1 million, and the smallest are \$3,500 or so. Byrne/JAG subgrantees report the largest average grant sizes, and Local Law Enforcement Block Grants (LLEBG) the smallest. Assessing the performance of programs in 2004 and 2005 should probably be shaped by the size of grants and the likelihood that past subgrantees will continue to seek funds in subsequent years.
6. ICJI grant funds are purchasing a combination of different quantities and types of criminal justice services, and it is not always easy to figure out exactly how much of what services are delivered where. Some grants should improve narcotics enforcement and others a variety of different services: juvenile counseling, victim's awards, other services to the victims of crime (e.g., domestic abuse in the STOP program), county drug courts, substance abuse programs, the physical safety of public schools, and a lot

² Victims in Indiana have rights delineated under Indiana state code 35-40-5-9. The provision of those rights are primarily notification and date tracking systems so that victims are told about matters regarding "the disposition of the criminal case involving the victim or the conviction, sentence, and release of a person accused of committing a crime against the victim" (IC 35-40-5-9, Section 8). Accurate criminal history records information systems are required for successful victim notification.



of others. As a result, assessment of subgrantee performance will often be dictated by the exact nature of the services produced.

7. Knowing the geographical and jurisdictional distribution of ICJI investments will help pinpoint areas receiving certain types of program funds (e.g., high victim services spending, but low youth spending). This can be viewed as a geographical service profile of Indiana jurisdictions. Criminal justice problems in those areas could be fine tuned with local program responses.
8. Criminal history records improvements require a more focused emphasis within the larger JAG funding program. More thought should be directed at defining outcomes desired from criminal history data base systems, and then funding initiatives that move toward those outcomes. In addition, some attention should be given to victim notification programs that rely on accurate and timely criminal history records system, up-to-date on dispositions. Some Victim Services funding supporting notification systems could possibly be transferred to CHRIS or NCHIP.
9. If ICJI data on subgrantee performance were submitted electronically, better and more efficient management is possible. However, the predominant form of reporting at ICJI is via periodic hard copy reports, organized by grant number, and likely to remain so for at least the next year. The status of an automated grant reporting system is unclear. Vendors might provide a system that satisfies division directors and longer term evaluation questions, but does not link to fiscal grant management. A rudimentary database exists for the largest Byrne/JAG funded law enforcement priority—the 2002–03 MJTF data bases created by the Center—and similar 2004 and 2005 descriptive databases will be developed as programs are evaluated. ICJI is building the Indiana Meth Data Repository, which will synthesize different drug and meth-abuse data bases. Although these databases will be useful to ICJI research staff if they choose to add additional data, they will not meet the financial accountability needs of grant administration.
10. A review of FY 2004 federal OJP, OVS, and COPS grants monies awarded to Indiana, by city, found that a significant number of other jurisdictional entities within the state were being funded by ICJI as well as receiving direct funding from the federal DOJ. ICJI should determine whether it matters if local jurisdictions can choose between seeking state grants versus direct applications to the feds.
11. This Phase 1 due diligence effort created a two-year evaluation plan to assess as many of the ICJI-administered programs as possible. The Center developed a preliminary schedule of funding stream assessment reports during the next two years (see Appendix III). As reports on major programs are reviewed, ICJI might need to train subgrantees in performance reporting. The Center is currently creating performance measures for each of the divisions for major programs. Those measures can be revised by ICJI staff after detailed evaluations of the programs are completed.
12. As Indiana's designated Statistical Analysis Center (SAC), ICJI should take advantage of annual SAC research grant opportunities. ICJI has not acted as a clearinghouse or repository for crime and other criminal justice information, although there are a variety of initiatives underway in the United States. In spring and summer of 2005, ICJI research staff and the Center developed a \$50,000 grant to support the Indiana Meth Data Repository. It was reportedly the first time ICJI had applied for a SAC grant, although the JRSA solicits special SAC-based applications at least once a year. These applications can focus on special research needs, and ICJI research staff should be encouraged to apply for JRSA SAC funds annually. The next two years of research assessments and evaluations should move ICJI towards a model more similar to other states. Improvements in UCR data and reporting ratios could offer performance dividends and better local intelligence and crime reporting. One of the midwestern exemplars of state crime data collection is the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (see Appendix II).





INTRODUCTION

The Indiana Criminal Justice Institute serves as “the state's planning agency for criminal justice, juvenile justice, traffic safety, and victim services.” The Institute develops long-range strategies for the effective administration of Indiana's criminal and juvenile justice systems and administers federal and state funds to carry out these strategies.³

In spring 2005, Center and ICJI administrative staff discussed the need to provide an overall picture of ICJI programs, and to develop a number of largely descriptive overviews of ICJI funding streams in order to design a longer term evaluation research strategy. In effect, the Center was asked to perform a due diligence examination of ICJI program activity. Based on these conversations, a Phase I memorandum of understanding between the Center and the Office of the Governor was agreed to May 5, 2005. Subsequently, a contract between the Center and the state of Indiana was finalized and executed on July 21, 2005. The tasks undertaken by the Center are summarized in Appendix I.

ICJI was interested in developing a long-range research and evaluation plan for three of its four operating divisions. Assessment of Traffic Safety division programs would remain with the Purdue University Center for the Advancement of Transportation Safety. Assessments of subgrantee performance within Drug and Crime Control, Victim Services, and Youth Services would be the focus of both Phase I and the longer-term evaluation plan. Therefore, in this Phase I due diligence effort, the Center developed information describing the overall operations, scope, and size of subgrantee programs within the three divisions.

The purpose of this Phase I report is to present the results of the Center's review of ICJI operations, funding streams, and programs. The report presents a descriptive profile of criminal justice programs offered by ICJI, their general levels of federal grant funding, approximate number of subgrantees, program operations, and a discussion of how the output and outcomes of the programs can be assessed. As well, ICJI has a research function to perform for purposes of state criminal justice planning, so another purpose of the report is to identify areas that deserve more focused policy and program analysis. This report will help prepare for the broader description, assessment, and evaluation of the ICJI grant programs that are to occur through October 2007.

Data used to compile this report came from several different sources, including the Indiana state budget as passed in April 2005, internal reports listing grant numbers and subgrantees from ICJI for the major funding streams, federal reports on Byrne funds and victim services covering Indiana jurisdictions, and other information obtained from ICJI staff regarding how programs operate, funding patterns, and various aspects of funded programs administered by ICJI. In addition, Center researchers examined samples of grant application files in the three primary divisions that are the focus of the Phase I due diligence report. Among other data, each operating division supplied the Center with a set of grant control spreadsheets, program descriptions, and other materials in November 2005, that were used to compile the summaries included in this report. Nevertheless, although all sources are deemed reliable, different sources sometimes indicated different amounts allocated to different ICJI programs. Where possible, the Center attempted to reconcile different indicators obtained in these various sources.

³ This is the mission of the ICJI, derived from its website, <http://www.in.gov/cji/>, accessed January 17, 2006.





OVERVIEW OF FUNDING STREAMS AND FUND DELIVERY

In fiscal years 2005–06 and 2006–07, the operating budgets for the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute were set at \$60.7 million each year.⁴ The as-passed budget posted by the Indiana State Budget Agency documents 84 separate account numbers assigned to ICJI, all consisting of some combination of general, dedicated, federal, local, and transfer funds. Although the state budget does not individually allocate the various accounts to the ICJI operating divisions, it is possible to roughly assign accounts based on their source and ultimate function. Approximately 69 accounts and about \$52.4 million (in each fiscal year) are allocated to the four operating divisions of ICJI—Drug and Crime Control, Traffic Safety, Victim Services, and Youth Services. Table 1 reflects the approximate breakdown of funds budgeted to ICJI divisions for the 2006 and 2007 fiscal years.⁵

Table 1. Indiana Criminal Justice Institute (ICJI) operating budget, as passed April 29, 2005

Budget, as approved	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	Approximate number of accounts
Drug and Crime Control	\$23,322,140	\$23,322,140	23
Victim Services	\$10,698,906	\$10,698,961	26
Youth Services	\$6,779,231	\$6,779,231	17
Subtotal	\$40,800,277	\$40,800,332	66
Traffic Safety	\$11,563,239	\$11,563,347	3
Total	\$52,363,516	\$52,363,679	69

Note

1. The line item budget includes a number of "transfer" funds that might tend to overstate totals.
2. Budget amounts include federal and state funding sources combined.

SOURCE: adapted from Indiana State Budget Agency, accessed January 23, 2006, at http://www.in.gov/sba/budget/2005_budget/as_passed/pdfs/ap_2005_c_2_5_pub_saf_data.pdf

Excluding the Traffic Safety division, ICJI administers 11 major federal funding streams within its Drug and Crime Control, Victim Services, and Youth Services divisions. The grants come primarily from the Office of Justice Programs (OJP) within the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ). The federal funds originate from programs within the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), and the Office for Victims of Crime (OVC). In addition, as a percentage of total Byrne/JAG grants each year, ICJI administers another program designed to pay the costs of modernizing criminal history record-keeping systems. The Youth Services Safe Haven program is

⁴ The source of Indiana state budget numbers discussed here is the Indiana State Budget Agency, *2005-07 As-Passed Budget*, available at http://www.in.gov/sba/budget/2005_budget/as_passed/index.html, accessed January 23, 2006.

⁵ The Center assigned each account number to one of the operating divisions. Although the Center used its best efforts to accurately assign the ICJI budget accounts, some represent transfers or internal allocations that might slightly overstate the volume of budgeted funds allocated to programs. Accordingly, these figures will not match exactly the size of ICJI division programs. They should, however, provide an approximate picture of how the Indiana state budget parses out the shares of total ICJI funding allocated to the divisions and the numbers of accounts assigned to each.



funded through state funds attached to Indiana Safe Schools. This report, therefore, focuses on the following major funding streams managed by ICJI:

1. Byrne grants and Justice Assistance Grants (JAG)
2. National Criminal History Improvement Program (NCHIP) and the Criminal History Records Information System (CHRIS)⁶
3. Local Law Enforcement Block Grant programs (LLEBG)
4. Residential Substance Abuse Programs (RSAT)
5. Paul Coverdell Forensic Sciences Program
6. Victims of Crime Act grants (VOCA)
7. Services, Training, Officers, and Prosecutors (STOP) grants
8. Juvenile Accountability Block grants (JABG)
9. Juvenile Title II Formula grants
10. Juvenile Title V grants
11. Indiana Safe Schools (Safe Haven)
12. Enforcing Underage Drinking Laws (EUDL)

Given the time required to program federal funds to state grants, and then to local services, there are also a number of other miscellaneous programs on the books with smaller grant amounts remaining to be spent. By January 2006, the 12 above represented the vast proportion of ICJI grant management. Because fund balances in each of the individual funding streams are not reduced to zero each year, carryover funds begin to develop for many of the programs. The net result is that some subgrantee programs are given grants in one year using funds from an earlier year's unexpended funds. As shown in Table 1, this means that even though ICJI has a dozen major funding streams, the actual number of accounts from which these funds are drawn is closer to approximately 69 budgeted line items.

In the most general terms, subgrantees obtain grant awards from ICJI based on a calendar of proposal submission and award decisions for each funding stream. Funding requests from subgrantees are administered primarily through a grant submission, review, and award process governed by a schedule that varies depending on which program's funds are being disbursed. As part of their proposals, applicants are generally asked to submit problem statements, program goals and objectives, and program activities, along with budgets describing anticipated expenditures for personnel, equipment, outside contracts, travel, and other broad categories.

The calendar of grant submission and award processes varies among funding streams, in terms of both ICJI submissions to the U.S. Department of Justice funding divisions and Indiana subgrantee submissions to ICJI. For instance, grant applications due from ICJI for federal juvenile program funding differ from the calendar for Justice Assistance Grants (JAG). As of January 2006, the various dates concerning grant submissions are shown in Table 2.

⁶ The CHRIS program is not a separate federal funding stream but is funded from five (5) percent of the annual Byrne/JAG amount.



Table 2. ICJI Grant Applications Dates

ICJI Division/Funding Stream	Date ICJI must submit application to DOJ	Dates IN subgrantees must submit applications to ICJI	Annual funding timeline for subgrantees
Drug and Crime Control			
Byrne grants and JAG (see Note 1)	1/26/2006	not yet announced	
National Criminal History Improvement Program (NCHIP) (see Note 2)	not yet announced for 2006		
Local Law Enforcement Block Grant programs (LLEBG)	LLEBG no longer exists; combined with Byrne to create JAG		
Residential Substance Abuse Programs (RSAT)	1/19/2006	5/1/2006	
Paul Coverdell Forensic Sciences Program (see Note 3)	not yet announced for 2006		
Victim Services			
Victims of Crime Act grants (VOCA)	Deadline for 2006 not yet available. In previous years, deadlines were set between 2/15 and 4/30	2/1/2006	7/1 through 6/30
Services, Training, Officers, and Prosecutors (STOP) grants	10/1/2006	2/1/2006	7/1 through 6/30
Youth Services (see Note 4)			
Juvenile Accountability Block grants (JABG)	2/28	8/1	10/1 through 9/30
Juvenile Title II Formula grants	3/31	2/1	4/1 through 3/31
Juvenile Title V grants	1/31	8/1	10/1 through 9/30
Indiana Safe Schools (Safe Haven)	State Legislature allots by end of session each year	4/30	9/1 through 5/31
Enforcing Underage Drinking Laws (EUDL)	1/31	4/1	6/1 through 5/31

Notes

1. Although the Byrne program no longer exists in new monies, ICJI will spend Byrne monies awarded in past years until all funding cycles (including extensions) have ended. Byrne was combined with the Local Law Enforcement Block Grant Program to create JAG. While technically the program is the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program, BJA is trying to stop references to Byrne in order to establish a separate identity for JAG.
2. Once ICJI receives the solicitation for the 2006 NCHIP they can then advise the Indiana State Police (ISP). Nothing precludes ICJI from determining a project under NCHIP that they want to have implemented. If that was the case, they would probably work with ISP to establish project parameters, but this might be a project that other agencies apply for and receive awards.
3. Due to the specificity of the program the eligible applicants in Indiana are limited to those agencies with forensic crime labs. There are two types of awards for Coverdell. The discretionary portion is applied for jointly by ISP and Marion County. Their application for 2005 is to eliminate a backlog in firearms examinations. In the competitive portion each agency applies separately. ISP still has to apply through ICJI. Marion County applied on their own. This grant is not the type that local agencies could use to start a crime lab unit or to purchase supplies or equipment for crime scene processing. Also labs must be accredited.
4. According to ICJI staff, ICJI has three years to expend funds received from OJJDP. ICJI may ask for no cost/one year extensions on grant funds with the exception of JABG funds for which no extensions are given.

After grants are awarded, most subgrantees are required to provide periodic reports on program activity on typically a semi-annual or annual basis. However, the extent of performance or activity reporting varies widely across the grant programs and within the population of subgrantees. Some subgrantees provide few if any performance metrics, and for those that do there is considerable variety to the quantity and quality of information submitted. For example, multijurisdictional task forces are required to complete detailed report forms twice a year that list personnel, drugs seized, arrests, convictions, asset forfeitures, and many other general output and outcome measurements useful in the assessment of MJTF operations. Subgrantees of Victim Services grants provide some detailed “persons-served” information as part of federal grant reporting to the OVC. Other subgrantees might provide less information in their annual or semi-annual reports and with the exception of MJTFs, most reporting appears to be done in narrative form.



The Role of the ICJI Board in Funding Decisions

The ICJI Board of Trustees reviews all proposals and makes final funding decisions. In addition, the Board of Trustees reviews the four-year statewide strategy for Byrne (now JAG). The current strategy runs through 2007.⁷ It is a significant priority for current ICJI executive staff that these decisions be based on accountability for past program management and research-based decision making. Typically, however, the ICJI Board has had little empirical data or program evaluation evidence to guide its decision making. The Board identified eleven state priorities that are linked to the 29 Byrne focus areas. For future strategic planning, there are only six program purposes for JAG—law enforcement, prosecution and courts, prevention and education, corrections and community corrections, drug treatment and planning, and evaluation and technology improvement. The new JAG purpose areas replace the former Byrne and LLEBG priorities for future funding decisions.

A review of current subgrantee files finds that the amount requested from ICJI and the amount awarded is typically not the same amount. Discussion with ICJI staff suggests that award amounts are sometimes adjusted to reflect continued federal funding cuts. In many cases the amount awarded is only what was awarded in previous years. There has been no systematic attempt to award monies based on performance.

In addition, some ICJI grant programs differ in terms of whether the awards are based on competitive proposals or on an agency or jurisdiction simply meeting some defined criteria (e.g., Safe Haven).

⁷ *Indiana's Statewide Strategy for Drug Control, Violence Prevention, and System Improvement: Fiscal Years 2004-2007*, report prepared by the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute, No date.



OVERVIEW OF SERVICE DELIVERY

The services delivered by ICJI throughout the state consist of processing and administering grant funds for various police and prosecuting agencies, courts, correction agencies, city and county governments, victim services organizations, and other offices involved in producing criminal justice services for juveniles and adults. Grants awarded by ICJI go to hundreds of Indiana jurisdictions and agencies in order to fund a wide variety of activities. These agencies are engaged in the actual production of criminal justice services in the state. Subgrantees receive grant awards and implement local programs that create services for a variety of justice organizations (e.g., police, prosecutors, sheriff, corrections, courts, etc.). Three of the major operating divisions in the ICJI—Drug and Crime Control, Victim Services, and Youth Services—are examined below in terms of total funding, numbers of subgrantees, average grant sizes, and share of total amounts allocated to specific funding streams.⁸ Various aspects of each division are discussed.

Drug and Crime Control (DCC)

Table 3 provides a listing of the major programs funded within DCC during 2003 and 2004, which accounted for about \$9.5 million in ICJI grant awards each year.⁹ These funds were distributed to 125 subgrantees in 2003 and 141 in 2004. The composition of subgrantees within DCC reflects a diverse group of individual police and sheriff's departments individually and selected smaller groups working within designated task forces, county courts, state agencies, county prosecutors, and a smaller group of miscellaneous criminal justice agencies.

⁸ The descriptions of funding in each division are based on total grant awards in individual fiscal years reported by the three divisions. For all but Safe Haven in Youth Services, these are federal grants. Divisions might be expending funds from other sources that are not detailed in this report.

⁹ The amount of DCC grant programs shown in Table 3 does not include the NCHIP grants. Information provided on NCHIP allocations did not clearly specify the subgrantees nor the amounts actually granted, although as shown in the exhibit, the amount provided to ICJI from BJA was noted.



Table 3. Drug and Crime Control Major Program Funding

Categories of funding streams	2003				2004			
	Grantees	Amount awarded from federal sources (\$)	Average (\$)	Percent total amount (%)	Grantees	Amount awarded from federal sources (\$)	Average (\$)	Percent total amount (%)
Byrne/JAG programs	56	8,002,319	142,899	83.6	46	7,984,985	173,587	84.5
MJTF	28	3,378,080	120,646	35.3	23	3,850,733	167,423	40.7
Courts	11	1,519,243	138,113	15.9	9	1,574,993	174,999	16.7
Corrections	2	1,217,712	608,856	12.7	3	1,015,922	338,641	10.7
Policing	7	967,696	138,242	10.1	5	751,276	150,255	7.9
CHRIS (Criminal history records)	1	501,998	501,998	5.2	1	490,318	490,318	5.2
Prosecutors	5	374,309	74,862	3.9	5	301,743	60,349	3.2
Other	2	43,281	21,640	0.5				
Local Law Enforcement Block Grant program (LLEBG)	66	383,978	5,818	4.0	90	383,978	4,266	4.1
Residential Substance Abuse Program (RSAT)	1	1,043,270	1,043,270	10.9	3	942,021	314,007	10.0
Paul Coverdell Forensic Sciences Program	2	144,305	72,153	1.5	2	141,571	70,786	1.5
National Criminal History Improvement Program (NCHIP)	SEE NOTE 1							
Total	125	\$9,573,872	\$76,591	100.0%	141	\$9,452,555	\$67,039	100.0%

Notes

1. NCHIP grant awards were reported as follows:
 - A. 2003 supplement awarded to ICJI for \$975,000 but no detailed data for 2003 or 2004 subgrantees were provided
 - B. 2004 grant awarded to ICJI for \$612,000 and 2004 award for \$222,733 to the Indiana State Police are reported
2. Totals for grantees and grants exclude ICJI as grant recipient.

SOURCE: Drug and Crime Control Division, ICJI, *Federal Grant Programs Review*, notebook November 2005.

The vast majority of these funds (84 percent) was allocated through the Byrne/JAG programs, and within the Byrne/JAG programs, more than one-third is devoted to Indiana’s multijurisdictional drug task forces. Apart from MJTFs, county courts are the next largest recipients of Byrne/JAG funds, and these grants primarily focus on the establishment or operations of drug courts. Although reflecting a small number of subgrantees of Byrne/JAG, corrections institutions receive a disproportionately large share of funds—two grants for 13 percent of funds in 2003, and three grants for 11 percent of funds in 2004—that pay primarily for selected Indiana Department of Corrections drug treatment programs.

The other DCC program categories reflect a mix of subgrantees and functions. The largest group of subgrantees consisted of Local Law Enforcement Block Grants (LLEBG). Its recipients were local police and sheriff’s departments. In 2003, most LLEBG subgrantees were officially cities and counties, while in 2004 police departments and sheriffs’ offices were the designated subgrantees. The LLEBG program



reflects, by far, the smallest average grants (about \$5,800 in 2003 and \$4,300 in 2004).¹⁰ In contrast, the largest grants from DCC are made within the Residential Substance Abuse Treatment program, whose very small number of subgrantees (one in 2003; three in 2004) includes primarily the Indiana Department of Corrections, and several other counties. The Coverdell Forensic Sciences grants go exclusively to the Indiana State Police crime lab and the Marion County Forensic Services Agency. The allocation of CHRIS and NCHIP funds has gone primarily to the Indiana State Police (although a NCHIP grant refund from the ISP has been requested) and to ICJI itself.

BJA documents note that Byrne monies (now Justice Assistance Grants) are awarded in two ways—60 percent of the allocation goes through ICJI, and 40 percent of these monies go directly to units of local government. As a result, entire programs funded by JAG funds largely by-pass ICJI, including Prescription Drug Monitoring Program, Gang Resistance Education and Training, Bulletproof Vest Partnership, Project Safe Neighborhood, Weed and Seed, COPS, Drug-Free Communities Support Programs, the President’s Family Justice Center Initiative, and State Criminal Alien Assistance. Some programs funded by Byrne/JAG (e.g., LLEBG) are going to the same entity (e.g., a county) both directly and through ICJI. Phase I and future evaluations by the Center will focus only on those federally-funded programs that are administered by ICJI. Other programs (e.g., Coroner’s Training Board, Police Corps) appear to be housed at ICJI in only a fiscal sense, and the recipients are not considered ICJI subgrantees.

The existing Byrne grant applications and reports appear to be cumbersome. Subgrantees are asked for many different types of information—goals, objectives, activities, problem identification statements, project descriptions, coordination between agencies, obstacles in implementation, their plan for continuation of the program after the end of federal funds, the overall impact of project, and other miscellaneous queries. These are all presented primarily in narrative form by subgrantees, not linked in any systematic way, not connected to outcome or output measures, and not followed up over time for grants that are continuing. The upcoming Center evaluation of programs will include recommendations for streamlining the reporting process from subgrantees.

In addition, ICJI staff may want to consider some standardization of the amount of funds for various activities or services. For example, the amount of Byrne monies being used for travel, salaries, vehicle lease, training, and confidential informant activities varies greatly from one MJTF to the next. In addition, other sorts of expenditures may need to be limited (e.g., water cooler supplies, janitorial services) as ICJI and the state of Indiana cope with reduced funding. For instance, subgrantees should probably be given additional clarification regarding what JAG will not pay for (e.g., typically construction is not paid for under Byrne/JAG unless it is associated with a correctional facility). Issues of this nature will be included and discussed in the more detailed evaluations during the next two years.

Funding streams within DCC are somewhat complicated by the process of grant extensions, unobligated funds, de-obligated funds, and “on-the-bubble” status. The primary reason for extensions is that monies were not spent during the calendar year of the grant. If the subgrantee does not spend all of the awarded monies, these funds come back to ICJI as de-obligated funds and will be re-awarded to another entity. It is unclear whether those newly appropriated old monies could then conceivably have four years to be spent by the new subgrantee. If at the end of a normal grant period a subgrantee files a final report that claims to have spent all of the awarded grant monies, but internal ICJI documentation shows that they did not draw all of their monies, ICJI will request a voucher on behalf of the subgrantee. One obvious recommendation is that subgrantees be trained so that they draw down all monies on their own behalf. It is also possible that

¹⁰ In 2005-06, the LLEBG program merged into the Justice Assistance Grant (JAG). It is not clear whether LLEBG subgrantee performance in 2003 or 2004 should be examined since it will not be a separate program from 2005 onward.



subgrantees are on-the-bubble—they were awarded a grant but they are not drawing monies, not filing required reports, etc. (As of December 2005 there were no Byrne subgrantees with on-the-bubble status.)

Victim Services (VS)

The Victim Services division of ICJI administered more than \$9 million in grants each year in 2004 and 2005, putting it on nearly equal financial footing with DCC. Table 4 lists the major VS programs for 2004 and 2005. There were at least 227 subgrantees provided funding by the VS division. However, the number of separate jurisdictions represented in this is almost certainly less than that, and at some point in the next two years it will make sense to chart the geographic and jurisdictional location of VS funding to determine the extent to which jurisdictions within the same county receive different VS grants.

Considering all VS grants, 162 subgrantees are recipients of Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) funds, and the remainder of STOP domestic violence money. Prosecutors' offices are the predominant recipients of VOCA and STOP funding from the VS division, absorbing about 39 percent of all victim funding in 2004 and 37 percent of funding in 2005. County governments receive the next largest share of VOCA (20 percent in 2004 and 23 percent in 2005) and STOP (more than five percent in 2004 and 2005).

Table 4. Victim Services Major Program Funding

Categories of funding streams	2004				2005			
	Grantees	Amount awarded from federal sources (\$)	Average (\$)	Percent total amount (%)	Grantees	Amount awarded from federal sources (\$)	Average (\$)	Percent total amount (%)
VOCA	162	7,030,731	43,400	75.7	162	6,995,340	43,181	77.0
Prosecutors	66	2,822,258	42,761	30.4	64	2,590,561	40,478	28.5
Counties	37	1,874,481	50,662	20.2	38	2,088,427	54,959	23.0
Cities and towns	25	916,410	36,656	9.9	21	789,928	37,616	8.7
Police and sheriff	15	641,367	42,758	6.9	18	728,129	40,452	8.0
State agency	5	308,984	61,797	3.3	4	221,467	55,367	2.4
Courts	11	289,589	26,326	3.1	13	395,186	30,399	4.4
Other	3	177,642	59,214	1.9	4	181,642	45,411	2.0
STOP	65	2,255,355	34,698	24.3	63	2,087,352	33,133	23.0
Prosecutors	30	810,742	27,025	8.7	28	762,831	27,244	8.4
Counties	11	564,057	51,278	6.1	10	481,902	48,190	5.3
Cities and towns	12	534,670	44,556	5.8	10	450,059	45,006	5.0
Police and sheriff	8	244,488	30,561	2.6	11	338,654	30,787	3.7
Other	4	101,398	25,350	1.1	4	53,906	13,477	0.6
Total	227	\$9,286,086	\$40,908	100.0%	225	\$9,082,692	\$40,368	100%

Note:

1. Totals for grantees and grants exclude ICJI as grant recipient.

One factor that complicates assessment of VOCA and STOP programs is that some proportion of the governmental jurisdictions that receive these grants subsequently turn around and transfer these funds to nonprofit victim services organizations. The reason this complicates assessment is that the grant applications from governmental subgrantees do not clearly specify where and to what other agencies the funds they receive will ultimately go. Thus, a portion of VOCA and STOP funds are ultimately used by



nonprofit agencies to actually produce the services consumed by the various victims of crime across the state. Knowing which subgrantees are distributing funds to other victim services groups can only be known by contacting the governmental units receiving VS grants.

Nonetheless, based on reviews of ICJI reports that have been provided to the federal OVC, it appears that most VS subgrantees are required to provide at least minimal information about the kinds of victim services being funded (e.g., domestic violence, child abuse, robbery or assault victims, etc.), and within these categories the subgrantees are further reporting some “people-served” kinds of measurements to the federal grant management system used by NIJ’s OVC (e.g., number of victims counseled, cash grants to victims, number of counseling sessions, etc.). It does not appear likely that the activity measures calculated for individual subgrantees goes much beyond numbers of people receiving services—that is, other more outcome-oriented measures of victim services are not being developed or required.

At this point, the best strategy for the future examination of VOCA and STOP subgrantees would appear to be some type of stratified or cluster sampling methodology. Using this approach, a stratified sample of victim subgrantees could be surveyed with quantitative comparisons (largely based on persons served in broad victim categories such as sexual assault, domestic violence, assaults, etc.). However, another option is to visit a few local victim services operations in order to perform highly detailed qualitative assessments of service delivery. Either way, evaluating the VOCA and STOP programs will probably require more sophisticated selection and sampling of test subgrantees, and will take the longest to complete.

In 2000–01, a broad description of victim services programs throughout the state was funded by ICJI, and performed by the Indiana Victim Services Assessment Project, composed of faculty and staff at Indiana University.¹¹ The report provided largely descriptive information about the organization of victim service delivery within Indiana and the perceptions of victims service providers about what types of services should be delivered to the victims of crime throughout the state. No output or outcome information that could be used in a more in-depth assessment of victim services was developed or discussed within the report. Since its completion, there does not appear to have been any additional follow-up regarding the findings from that research.

Youth Services (YS)

Grants awarded within the state of Indiana for programs related to juvenile justice are perhaps the most varied of all the ICJI divisions. The bulk of YS grant programs are funded from four streams: Juvenile Accountability Block Grants (JABG), Title II formula grants, Title V community prevention grants, Indiana Safe Schools, and Enforcing Underage Drinking Laws. In 2003, YS grant awards totaled approximately \$7.5 million and approximately \$5.6 million in 2004.¹²

¹¹ See Hare, S. *Indiana Victim Services Assessment Project: Summary of Findings*. Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis. March 2001. Funded by the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute, grant numbers 97VA001, 97VA170, 97VA217, 98VA129, and 00VA163.

¹² There was a substantial decline in the number and amount of JABG funding awards in 2004, which accounted for the drop in grant funding of nearly \$2 million from 2003 to 2004.



Table 5. Youth Services Major Program Funding

Categories of funding streams	2003				2004			
	Grantees	Amount awarded from federal sources (\$)	Average (\$)	Percent total amount (%)	Grantees	Amount awarded from federal sources (\$)	Average (\$)	Percent total amount (%)
Juvenile Accountability Block Grants	70	2,698,600	38,551	36.1	11	438,906	39,901	7.8
Courts	20	1,504,323	75,216	20.2	4	272,920	68,230	4.8
Police	5	338,866	67,773	4.5				
Probation	12	257,443	21,454	3.4				
Other	11	191,484	17,408	2.6				
Youth/Family services	8	175,346	21,918	2.3				
Community corrections	7	110,407	15,772	1.5	1	20,000	20,000	0.4
Prosecutor	4	58,969	14,742	0.8				
Schools	2	46,762	23,381	0.6				
County government	1	15,000	15,000	0.2	6	145,986	24,331	2.6
Title II formula grants	32	1,030,557	32,205	13.8	30	1,143,547	38,118	20.3
Courts	5	309,827	61,965	4.2	7	464,476	66,354	8.3
County government	6	200,382	33,397	2.7	9	274,056	30,451	4.9
Other	3	50,005	16,668	0.7	7	148,579	21,226	2.6
State agency	4	93,572	23,393	1.3	2	140,483	70,242	2.5
School corporations	7	193,235	27,605	2.6	4	102,613	25,653	1.8
Police and sheriff	2	20,000	10,000	0.3	1	13,340	13,340	0.2
Auditors	3	106,883	35,628	1.4				
Community corrections	2	56,653	28,326	0.8				
Title V community prevention grants	No grants awarded in 2003				5	301,000	60,200	5.3
Indiana Safe Schools (Safe Haven)	224	3,378,749	\$15,084	45.3	233	3,389,970	14,549	60.2
Enforcing Underage Drinking Laws (EUDL)	1	357,660	\$357,660	4.8	3	356,211	118,737	6.3
Total	327	\$7,465,566	\$22,830	100%	282	\$5,629,634	\$19,963	100%

Note:

1. Totals for grantees and grants exclude ICJI as grant recipient
2. Totals exclude the following amounts to ICJI for grant administration:
 - A. For JABG: \$306,840 in 2003 and \$414,190 in 2004.
 - B. For Title II: \$292,050 in 2003 and \$279,761 in 2004.
3. County government figures include grants to county commissioners or the county.
4. Totals for grantees and grants exclude ICJI as grant recipient.

The largest number of subgrantees among all ICJI grant programs is served within the YS division (327 in 2003 and 282 in 2004). This is due in large part to the Indiana Safe Schools program. School district grants (233 subgrantees in 2004) primarily fund Safe Haven, a program designed as part of a larger program called Indiana Safe Schools. The ICJI website description notes that

Safe Haven grants may be awarded to school corporations for any one, or a combination of the following activities/purposes: (1) School Safety Plan... which includes provisions for zero



tolerance of alcohol, tobacco, drugs, and weapons on school property [and/or]; (2) Safe Haven programs that keep the school open for all students before and after normal operating hours....¹³

In 2003, Safe Haven absorbed approximately \$3.4 million (45.3 percent) of YS division funds. Safe Haven grants were awarded at about the same level in 2004, but increased their share of all youth services grants to nearly 60 percent in 2004 (largely because of the decline in JABG fund awards). Overall, this represented approximately 14 percent of all ICJI grant awards funded in 2004.

Apart from school districts funded by the YS division, Indiana courts and county governments received the lion's share of other juvenile programs funded by JABG and Title II grant awards. Nonetheless, there is a comparatively wide variety of other agencies that have obtained YS grant funding, including police departments, county probation offices, youth and family services agencies, and prosecutors' offices. The variety of agencies receiving juvenile program funds from ICJI is easily matched by the numbers of different programs and purpose areas that can be financed. Federal OJJDP grant guidelines indicate an extended list of priority areas toward which juvenile funds can be applied. For instance, money from JABGs can go to any of more than a dozen program areas, and Title II formula grant funds can be applied to more than 30 different program or purpose areas. In 2006, the YS is developing a set of more focused priorities that can be used to guide the stream of YS program evaluations during the next two years.

As for other YS funding streams, in 2003 all EUDL funds were granted to the Governor's Commission for a Drug-Free Indiana. In 2004, EUDL funded the same commission as well as the Indiana State Excise Police. The Title V community prevention grants were not funded in 2003, but then awarded approximately \$301,000 to five subgrantees in 2004 (four counties and one superior court).

¹³ For the full description, see <http://www.in.gov/cji/youth/safe.html>, accessed January 23, 2006.





ANALYSIS OF ICJI FUNDING STREAMS

For purposes of overall comparison, a summary of funding, subgrantees, average grants, and share of total grant amounts for the three divisions for the year 2004 are shown in Table 6. Although 2004 was an atypical year for JABG funding awards (i.e., JABG grant awards declined precipitously), ICJI nevertheless administered funds to approximately 650 subgrantees, using about \$24.4 million in total grants. As demonstrated by the variety of funding streams and the number of different settings and activities, ICJI administers a remarkable array of programs among these 650 subgrantees. It is a challenge to profile a typical subgrantee because there is such diversity in agencies and objectives. Even a quick examination of ICJI subgrantees suggests that they all have:

- Varied missions (e.g., crime control, drug enforcement, incarceration, court systems, fighting juvenile delinquency, etc.)
- Different organizational settings (e.g., sheriff's office, municipal police department, state corrections institution, nonprofit service providers, parole and probation offices, multi-jurisdictional task forces, specialized courts)
- Different governmental units (e.g., towns, cities, counties, state agencies)
- Frequent public/nonprofit and public/private partners in the funding arrangements (e.g., Department of Corrections and a substance abuse treatment center, prosecutor's office and nonprofit victims services agency)
- Frequent collaborations among criminal justice agencies (e.g., prosecutor's offices and drug courts, MJTFs)

Table 6. Summary of Division Breakdowns

Categories of funding streams	2004			
	Grantees	Amount awarded from federal sources (\$)	Percent total amount (%)	Average (\$)
Drug and Crime Control	141	9,452,555	38.8	67,039
Byrne/JAG programs	46	7,984,985	32.8	173,587
Local Law Enforcement Block Grant program (LLEBG)	90	383,978	1.6	4,266
Residential Substance Abuse Program (RSAT)	3	942,021	3.9	314,007
Paul Coverdell Forensic Sciences Program	2	141,571	0.6	70,786
Victim Services	227	9,286,086	38.1	40,908
VOCA	162	7,030,731	28.9	43,400
STOP	65	2,255,355	9.3	34,698
Youth Services	282	5,629,634	23.1	19,963
Juvenile Accountability Block Grants (JABG)	11	438,906	1.8	39,901
Title II formula grants	30	1,143,547	4.7	38,118
Title V community prevention grants	5	301,000	1.2	60,200
Indiana Safe Schools (Safe Haven)	233	3,389,970	13.9	14,549
Enforcing Underage Drinking Laws (EUDL)	3	356,211	1.5	118,737
Totals	650	\$24,368,275	100%	\$37,490

Notes

1. 2004 is the only year for which data are provided in common for all programs
2. Excludes NCHIP and CHRIS from DCC division



These widespread differences among subgrantees help to create the complicated arrangement of grant awards administered by ICJI that provides funds for local crime and drug control, juvenile, and victims programs all over the state. The ability to describe the precise operations of 650 subgrantee programs under all the funding streams is limited, so the future focus of limited assessment and evaluation resources should be shaped at least in part by this Phase I due diligence review. From this review, it seems evident that regarding future evaluation efforts, many factors will affect the ability of ICJI and the Center to conduct subgrantee program assessments and evaluations. To anticipate these factors, and think about how to deal with them in the context of future assessments, the following list is provided. All will affect the evaluation of subgrantee programs and performance.

1. Missions. The missions of these various organizations exhibit wide variety. For example, multi-jurisdiction drug task forces have operating objectives and work units that should be geared toward developing true interjurisdictional arrangements and working environments for the enforcement of narcotics laws. A MJTF should join people from multiple organizations all together in the same space. MJTF funding absorbs the proportionately largest share of ICJI subgrantee activity and, unlike VOCA and Safe Haven, is limited to a small number of subgrantees—about 22 MJTFs statewide in 2004–05. The state has funded as many as 35 MJTFs in previous years. Measuring the performance of MJTFs is complicated by the nature of data that have been regularly reported. While these data are valuable, they might not tell ICJI what it needs to know about MJTF productivity. Other organizations have other, very different missions. Prosecutors' offices, drug courts, human service agencies, local police and sheriff, and other criminal justice agencies perform very different services and have very different missions and objectives.
2. Performance measurement. The extent to which subgrantees report operating metrics varies considerably. Some subgrantees submit detailed semi-annual reports (MJTFs) that include a variety of quantitative output (and some outcome) data. There are some automated VOCA output data (defined generally as numbers of victims served under various topical programs) submitted to the federal OVC that can help assess VOCA subgrantee performance in 2004 or 2005. Other subgrantee groups, however, do not provide systematic measurement data. In their annual applications, most grantees report a broad goal or objective (some pose it as a problem statement), some operating activities, and some program activities or outputs/outcomes (loosely defined). The Center has not yet examined Safe Haven files to see how much reporting diversity exists there.
3. Organizational settings. Each stream is composed of several categories of grant recipients, representing several different sets of organizational environments. Grants are made to city and town governments, county governments, county boards of commissioners, school districts, police departments, units of state agencies, prosecuting attorneys' offices, sheriff's, and others. Thus, the government or agency unit that is the primary recipient of grants varies across the funding streams. From this it is clear that the ICJI has funding relationships with a remarkable array of public, private, and nonprofit organizations within the state of Indiana. This includes at a minimum police, multijurisdictional task forces, prosecutor's offices, corrections facilities, arrestee processing centers, school districts, prison substance abuse programs, counties, sheriff's offices, and other operating units. Other state agencies (Indiana Department of Correction, the Indiana State Police, ICJI itself) are also large grant recipients. Some of these funds are further directed by the subgrantees to other local organizations such as nonprofit victim's services agencies, substance abuse and treatment programs, and other organizations offering various kinds of services. Some of these organizations might be private as well.
4. Internally-funded projects. In some cases, ICJI makes grants to itself. This occurs in two ways, and establishes ways of funding ICJI administration and management, improved criminal history records information, and other programmatic initiatives targeted by ICJI and its board of trustees. This occurs, for example, in the Byrne/JAG program and in Youth Services. A percentage of Byrne/JAG money is



devoted to Criminal History Records Information Systems (CHRIS) and becomes a grant (in effect) to ICJI. The overall state objective for its criminal history systems is not totally clear, although a separate state initiative, the Judicial Technology and Automation Commission (JTAC) shares a very similar objective. It is not clear whether those funds are being invested in criminal history record-keeping and data sharing systems that could simultaneously satisfy the needs of the police and the courts. In some jurisdictions, these are referred to ProsLink systems. More information is needed to understand how those funds are improving record-keeping systems (e.g., LiveScan, AFIS). Sometimes, ICJI uses its internal funds to target specific programs. For instance, in 2005, ICJI received a Youth Services grant of \$312,000 from its Board of Trustees to fund SKIP (Services to Kids of Incarcerated Parents). In turn, ICJI turned over operating responsibility for the SKIP program to a private company that would implement and manage the mentoring program. So there is question of whether and how program grants made directly to ICJI should be assessed and evaluated.

5. Grant sizes. The comparative sizes of ICJI grants also vary widely around an average of approximately \$37,000, from about \$14,000 to more than \$314,000. Average grant sizes are largest in Drug and Crime Control, although the Byrne/JAG program focuses on a comparatively small number of subgrantees. Funds to MJTFs are declining, so decisions will have to be made about how to help finance remaining task forces that truly meet an interjurisdictional standard by pulling different law enforcement agencies together with better coordination and more information sharing through secure channels. Programs set up in Indiana state and local courts seem to increase average grant size (which for Byrne/JAG was approximately \$175,000 in 2004), as do the grants dedicated to corrections activities, more specifically substance abuse programs for offenders in prison or out on probation and parole (around \$320,000 per grant). A small number of substance abuse facilities or programs funded by ICJI through the corrections system (present in both the Byrne/JAG and RSAT funding streams), for example, represented about eight percent of all grant awards in 2004.
6. Services produced and purchased by grants. In addition, ICJI grant funds are purchasing a combination of different quantities and types of criminal justice services, and it is not always straightforward to figure out exactly how much of what services are delivered where. In the most general terms, they focus on providing services to the victims of crimes, strengthening local law enforcement capacity and facilitating cooperative interjurisdictional relationships, and preventing or dealing with the circumstances of juvenile delinquency. In some cases, they pay for people in jobs designed to implement service delivery systems, but in others the funds might simply buy equipment or pay for the subcontracting services of, for example, nonprofit drug abuse treatment organizations. They might pay the salary of a police officers or prosecutors assigned to a MJTFs. Counselors for victims will be paid using VOCA and STOP funds. In other cases, they might pay for the purchase of AFIS LiveScan fingerprint systems or streamlined electronic bugging devices. In short, ICJI grant funds purchase an extremely wide variety of people, products, and services within the Indiana criminal justice system.
7. Geographic location of all grants. It would be useful to know the geographic location of ICJI funding decisions. With 650 subgrantees, virtually all parts of Indiana are likely to be represented. Knowing the geographical and jurisdictional distribution of ICJI investments would help pinpoint areas receiving certain types of program funds (high victim but low youth spending) so that criminal justice problems in those areas could be fine tuned with local program responses. In addition, it will help identify areas of the state that are receiving multiple grant awards for similar and different criminal justice programs. It is possible that some focused geographical analysis could result in increased program efficiencies for the ICJI divisions.
8. Criminal history data initiatives. Criminal history records improvements evidently require a more focused emphasis within the larger Byrne/JAG funding program. Some special attention should be given to ICJI funding streams directed at improving the status of criminal history records and information systems within the state. Federal funding guidelines require that there be some linkage



between investments in criminal history improvement and the Byrne/JAG programs. The five percent set-aside from annual Byrne/JAG awards is to be applied to criminal history records information systems within the state, but it is not clear how the two funding streams are being coordinated. ICJI investments in criminal history improvements deserve more sustained attention.

Based on a recent federal review, some NCHIP investments in the Indiana State Police are supposed to be re-programmed, and a plan for coordinating criminal justice information systems within the state is currently under development. For example, a review of federal grant applications used by ICJI to allocate Byrne/JAG funds indicated that subgrantees are required to report local UCR data to a state repository; thus, all recipients of Byrne/JAG monies are required to submit arrest data to the Indiana State Police (ISP). According to Indiana Code 5-2-5-2, the ISP must be the repository for criminal history data and arrests for reportable offenses. In fact, many jurisdictions receiving ICJI funds do not submit regular UCR data to the ISP or the FBI, or at a minimum may be unaware of whether or not their jurisdiction is in compliance. Their data are estimated, and can have an effect on annual JAG funding allocations because the JAG allocation formula is based on population and UCR violent crime counts (offenses known to the police).

For many of these jurisdictions, it is possible they are violating a promise incorporated into the LLEBG and JAG grant applications that they will regularly submit UCR data to the appropriate state agency in exchange for receiving funds. Given the poor reporting ratios across the state, it appears that too many jurisdictions are agreeing to submit regular UCR data, but not doing so. At a minimum, subgrantees should be required to submit UCR data in order to obtain annual measures of crimes known to the police. A state UCR repository needs to be clearly established. It might already be located in the ISP, but it is not evident that there is an active UCR program at work. It is possible that CHRIS monies could be used to assess the level of compliance with Indiana code requiring subgrantees to report crime data and the level of compliance at ISP regarding housing this data. Attention should be paid to the Indiana code language because there might be some semantic confusion regarding reported offenses (all known offenses) versus arrests.

Better locally reported crime data can help ICJI and the state of Indiana bring effective focus to its criminal justice investments. CHRIS funds could be used to facilitate better information sharing (UCR, JTAC, etc.). For example, the upcoming Indiana Meth Data Repository will be greatly enhanced if smaller counties and local jurisdictions all report index and non-index crimes to provide the most complete picture of crimes known to the police. Drug arrests can be broken down by type of drugs to locate the concentration of arrests for synthetics (e.g., meth) compared to cocaine or heroin. At a minimum, the non-index crimes should be reported regularly because they include a variety of crime types useful in signaling criminal activity in certain jurisdictions (drug arrests, fraud and embezzlement, public disorder, domestic abuse, and other non-trivial criminal indicators.) The longer-term ideal is to have incident-based reporting systems (known nationally as NIBRS, but practiced by only a small subset of police agencies) that could support better intelligence about local crime environments. Incident-based reporting systems require more reporting by local police and sheriff's, but can aid tactical and strategic decision-making by state and local law enforcement agencies. To this end, ICJI could probably fund UCR and NIBRS programs in Indiana by using CHRIS and CHIP funds, but no coordinated program to fully and effectively link jurisdictions appears to have been fully designed yet.

Victim notification programs mandated by state law (I.C. 35-40-5-9) will require prompt responses each day a court is in session, where various dispositions occur daily. It is conceivable that limited criminal history information funding could help with this notification process, partly because it must rely on the larger disposition reporting system. Victim Services funds can pay for Victims Advocates who must presumably manage notification systems. Until an assessment of the Victim Services



programs is conducted, the implementation and effectiveness of victim notification requirements is an open question.

9. Grant management systems. The automation of grant management is a pressing need within ICJI. Center staff participated in discussions with possible vendors of grant management software. The status of automation (i.e., the selection of a vendor) remains unclear. In some cases it appears that vendors might be able to provide a grants management system that meets the needs of division directors and longer term evaluation questions, but does not link to fiscal grant management issues. A rudimentary database now exists for the largest Byrne funded law enforcement priority—the MJTF databases created by the Center—and similar baseline descriptive databases will be developed as programs are evaluated. However, although these databases may be useful to ICJI research staff if they choose to add additional waves of data, they will not meet the needs of grant administration and fiscal management.
10. Additional SAC research funding. One of the goals of the state government–university partnership (in addition to research–based decision making) is to look for opportunities for additional funding for the state. In July 2005, the Center worked with ICJI research staff to develop the first Indiana Statistical Analysis Center (SAC) grant application to the Justice Research and Statistics Association. The \$50,000 grant will help fund development of the Indiana Meth Data Repository. This was reportedly the first time that ICJI had applied for a SAC grant, although the JRSA solicits special SAC–based applications at least once a year. These applications can focus on special research needs, and ICJI research staff should be encouraged to apply for these funds annually.
11. Federal grants that by-pass ICJI. A review of federal reports describing FY 2004 OJP, OVS, and COPS grants monies awarded to Indiana, by city, found that a number of entities were being funded by ICJI as well as receiving direct funding from the federal DOJ. It may behoove ICJI staff and the ICJI Board to assess the extent to which a county might not only be receiving multiple Byrne/JAG monies from CJI (e.g., a drug court, a MJTF, and a drug prosecution unit) but also the extent to which that county or jurisdiction might be receiving direct federal funds for similar programs.
12. Two-year subgrantee performance assessment schedule. One goal of the Phase 1 due diligence process was to create a longer term evaluation plan of as many of the ICJI–administered programs as possible. After compiling the information discussed within this Phase I report, the Center developed a preliminary schedule of funding stream assessment reports during the next two years. The preliminary schedule is included in Appendix II. As these reports are reviewed, it is likely that ICJI will need to plan for significant training for subgrantees. In some cases, ICJI may want to begin training subgrantees now (and it is the case that some training is taking place) but the Center recommends that ICJI creates a more formal training schedule and plan for all subgrantees in all divisions over the next two years. The Center is currently creating performance measures for each of the divisions for major programs. Those measures will likely be revised by ICJI staff after detailed evaluations of the programs are completed.
13. Other models for state criminal justice planning. Part of the Phase 1 exploration included some study of the ICJI equivalents in other states. Center staff will continue to look at other states for best practices. In the past, ICJI has been primarily focused on grants administration and has played a lesser role in research and analysis of crime and criminal justice in Indiana, and unlike other states, ICJI has not acted as a clearinghouse or repository for crime information. Phase II should move ICJI towards a model more similar to other states.



APPENDIX I: SUMMARY OF PHASE I TASKS TO BE PERFORMED BY THE CENTER

Phase I: Inventory of programs and organizational management, leading up to a 2005-06 scope of work for evaluation and statistical analysis:

1. Develop a profile of ICJI operations. Background and supporting detail for a *description of major programs* administered by ICJI, based on generalized sources and uses of funds, and the *identification of criterion-based versus competitively-based programs*.
2. Describe the volume of incoming funds, how much of those funds are discretionary, how much is fixed, *how much can be shifted to other criminal justice uses based on executive priorities*, and how much is available for the evaluation of program effectiveness and efficiency.
3. Describe the decision making process as determined *by the calendar of incoming and outgoing criminal justice and other related funds*. Determinations of when annual reports are due to the feds, when grant applications are due and the development of three-year planning documents as required by federal funding.
4. *Identify funds available for evaluation*. Assessment and review of various selected original grant applications and paperwork associated with them.
5. Develop *recommendations for the highest priority programs for evaluations of effectiveness and efficiency*. Priority will be established by the level of funding, likelihood of continued future funding, the calendar of funding, and executive priorities. Incorporate executive priorities into the final report
6. Answer questions concerning *what databases need to be automated first* (and what databases are already automated) in order to improve the quality of grant allocation decision making and grant monitoring. Establish baselines of information for high priority programs. Survey other states for information regarding the automation of ICJI-type databases
7. Assist in *determining the functional divisions and topical areas that are most appropriate for ICJI* based on the above assessments of priority.
8. Develop a detailed future scope of work to guide *a set of evaluation studies of the effectiveness and efficiency of selected, high priority programs*.
9. Develop a description of *alternative organizational structures for Indiana's statistical analysis center (SAC)* in order to answer questions about the placement and structure of Indiana's statistical analysis functions. Explore the feasibility of moving the SAC status in Indiana to another entity, or guiding ICJI to improve their use of their SAC status for pursuing federal funds.



APPENDIX II: OVERVIEW OF STATE STATISTICAL ANALYSIS CENTERS

Prepared By Dona Sapp, March 2005

This appendix assembles and summarizes information gathered from the Justice Research and Statistics Association (JRSA), a national nonprofit organization of state Statistical Analysis Center (SAC) directors, researchers, and practitioners throughout government, academia, and criminal justice organizations, web site (<http://www.jrsa.org/sac/index.html>). SACs can be housed in universities. Also included are examples of information available at specific SAC sites including the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, Ohio Office of Criminal Justice Services, the Michigan Justice Statistics Center (housed at Michigan State University), and the Nevada Center for the Analysis of Crime Statistics (housed at UNLV). All the material presented below was harvested from the websites of the profiled SACs (e.g., FAQs, definitions, mission, reports and analyses produced, etc.) and should be considered fair use of the public domain descriptions the websites present.

The Statistical Analysis Centers (SACs) are units or agencies at the state government level that use operational, management, and research information from all components of the criminal justice system to conduct objective analyses of statewide and systemwide policy issues. There are currently SACs in 53 states and territories. The SACs vary in their placement within the state government structures. Some are within a criminal justice or general state planning or coordinating agency; some are part of a governor's advisory staff; and others are located in a line agency such as the state police, attorney general's office, or department of corrections. There are several housed in universities.

This diversity is also reflected in the SACs' roles and activities in their respective states. Some of the SACs concentrate on collecting and distributing specific criminal justice-related data sets, others are involved in active research on policy issues, and some have been instrumental in the design and implementation of various policies and automated information systems. JRSA annually compiles a directory known as Criminal Justice Issues in the States and maintains the Infobase of State Activities and Research (ISAR) which catalogs these activities.

Most of the SACs obtain their base financial support from the U.S. Justice Department's Bureau of Justice Statistics. Many also receive funding from other federal and state budget appropriations.

Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority

Among the SAC sites researched, the ICJIA site is by far the most comprehensive. County profiles are produced every three to four years, and individual reports (30-40 pages) are available for each county.

Created in 1983, the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority is a state agency dedicated to improving the administration of criminal justice. The Authority works to identify critical issues facing the criminal justice system in Illinois, and to propose and evaluate policies, programs, and legislation that address those issues. We also work to ensure the criminal justice system in Illinois is as efficient and effective as possible.

The Authority accomplishes its goals through efforts in four areas: 1) information systems and technology; 2) research and analysis; 3) policy and planning; and 4) grants administration.



Information Systems and Technology

- Develops, operates, and maintains computerized information systems for police agencies.
- Serves as the sole administrative appeal body for determining citizen challenges to the accuracy of their criminal history records.
- Monitors the operation of existing criminal justice information systems to protect the constitutional rights and privacy of citizens.

Research and Analysis

- Publishes research studies that analyze a variety of crime trends and criminal justice issues.
- Acts as a clearinghouse for information and research on crime and the criminal justice system.
- Audits the state central repositories of criminal history record information for data accuracy and completeness.
- Develops and tests statistical methodologies and provides statistical advice and interpretation to support criminal justice decision making.

Policy and Planning

- Develops and implements comprehensive strategies for drug and violent crime law enforcement, crime control, and assistance to crime victims using federal funds awarded to Illinois.
- Advises the governor and the General Assembly on criminal justice policies and legislation.
- Coordinates policymaking groups to learn about ongoing concerns of criminal justice officials.
- Develops and evaluates state and local programs for improving law enforcement and the administration of criminal justice.

Grants Administration

- Implements and funds victim assistance and violent crime and drug law enforcement programs under the federal Anti-Drug Abuse Act, Victims of Crime Act, Violence Against Women Act, and other grant programs as they become available.
- Monitors program activity and provides technical assistance to grantees.
- Provides staff support to the Illinois Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Council, an 11- member board working to curb motor vehicle theft.

Research and Evaluation – Publications by Topic

Below is a list of topics on which Authority publications are available. Most Authority publications dating back to 1999 are available in electronic PDF format. The Criminal Justice System topic links to the Authority's periodic profile series, including county profiles and juvenile county profiles.

- Arrestees
- Capital Punishment
- Community Policing
- Corrections
- Courts
- Crime
- Crime Analysis
- Crime Prevention
- Criminal History
- Criminal Justice System ★
- DMC/DMR
- Domestic Violence
- Drugs
- Firearms
- Gangs
- GIS
- Grants
- Homicide
- Juvenile
- Law Enforcement
- Motor Vehicle Offenders
- Policy/Planning
- Probation
- Prosecution
- Research/Evaluation
- Sentencing
- Sex Offenders
- Task Forces
- Technology
- Treatment
- Victimization



Ohio Office of Criminal Justice Services

SAC site (State of Ohio Crime Statistics web site) not as comprehensive as Illinois site – includes 2000-2002 data presented in the form of charts and tables.

Ohio Revised Code § 181.52 establishes the Ohio Office of Criminal Justice Services (OCJS) as the lead criminal justice planning agency for the state. Through its research, technology, grants administration and programmatic initiatives, OCJS serves agencies and communities committed to reducing and preventing crime across Ohio. Elevated to cabinet level status in 2000, OCJS is called on by the Administration and many different constituents to address a wide range of criminal justice issues. However, it does not take on a large role in state criminal justice research.

Essential services provided by OCJS:

- **Grants:** administers state and federal criminal justice grants to local subgrantees.
- **Research & Evaluation:** evaluates the effectiveness of criminal justice projects including law enforcement, corrections, courts, prevention and victim services.
- **CJIS:** coordinates Ohio's Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) Plan, and the development of automated systems to promote sharing crime information and data.
- **OIBRS:** collects, store and analyze crime data in the Ohio Incident-Based Reporting System Repository (OIBRS) to help law enforcement anticipate and prevent crime through a fully automated, voluntary crime reporting system.
- **OJIN:** implements the Ohio Justice Information Network (OJIN), allowing criminal justice professionals instant access to the most current criminal justice information in the state via a single web-based system.
- **Family Violence Prevention Center:** implements baseline funding for domestic violence information and initiatives.
- **Resources:** designs publications, programs and training based on criminal justice trends and needs.

Michigan Justice Statistics Center

Information gathered from the Michigan Justice Statistics Center web site (<http://www.cj.msu.edu/~people/stats.html>). No data currently available online.

The School of Criminal Justice, through executive order from the Governor, has been designated to be the location for the newly created Michigan Justice Statistics Center. Timothy S. Bynum, professor of the School, has been appointed director of the Center. MSU's Institute for Public Policy and Social Research (IPPSR) will also work with the Center.

The Center is funded by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, an agency within the federal Department of Justice, as part of its state Statistical Analysis Center Program. The principal role of this center is to conduct state-oriented policy research in criminal justice through the analysis of existing state level criminal justice data.

The Michigan Justice Statistics Center exemplifies MSU's philosophy of outreach. It formalizes a close working relationship between the University and state government by providing policy-relevant analysis in criminal justice. The Center provides an opportunity to train graduate students in the practice of conducting policy relevant research in the field of criminal justice.



Center for Analysis of Crime Statistics (Nevada)

This illustrates an information clearinghouse, or possibly data warehousing, approach. Information gathered from the Center for the Analysis of Crime Statistics web site at UNLV (<http://www.unlv.edu/centers/crimestats/index.htm>). No publications available online. Little statistics/data available online presented in the form of charts at the state, city, and district level.

The Center for the Analysis of Crime Statistics is the Statistical Analysis Center for the State of Nevada. The Center provides two essential functions. First, it serves as a clearinghouse for state and local crime and justice data. As a central repository for information supplied by the various components of the criminal justice system, the Center for the Analysis of Crime Statistics is able to provide a comprehensive picture of crime and justice in Nevada. In addition to serving as a clearinghouse, the Center for the Analysis of Crime Statistics also conducts policy-oriented research on a range of topics of concern to State and local policymakers and criminal justice practitioners.



APPENDIX III: PRELIMINARY SCHEDULE FOR FUNDING STREAM ASSESSMENTS

Proposed time lines for ICJI work, 1/25/06

Month	Research and report period	Date	Divisions		
			Crime and drug control	Victim services	Youth services
1	1	1-Jan-06			
2		1-Feb-06			
3		1-Mar-06	General performance metrics due		
4		1-Apr-06			
5	2	1-May-06	RSAT and Byrne (corrections) report		
6		1-Jun-06		STOP, part I	
7		1-Jul-06			Juvenile Formula II grants
8	3	1-Aug-06	Byrne drug courts and other judicial		
9		1-Sep-06		STOP, part I	
10		1-Oct-06			Juvenile Accountability Block Grants
11		1-Nov-06	LLEBG and Cloverdale Forensic Sciences report		
12	4	1-Dec-06			
13		1-Jan-07		VOCA, part I	
14		1-Feb-07	Criminal history records information report		
15		1-Mar-07			Other juvenile programs
16	5	1-Apr-07			
17		1-May-07		VOCA, part II	
18		1-Jun-07			Safe Haven
19	6	1-Jul-07	Byrne report: MJTF and other Byrne		
20		1-Aug-07			
21		1-Sep-07	Synthesized final report due for all divisions		
22		1-Oct-07	Contract ends		
23	6	1-Nov-07			
24		1-Dec-07			