

**Illinois' FFY14 Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant**  
**Application #2014-H1509-IL-DJ**

**Program Narrative**

**Introduction**

The State of Illinois, using the resources and office of its Administrating Agency, the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (Authority), has consistently pursued specific planning processes to develop and coordinate integrated approaches for its strategies that address issues within all components of the state's criminal justice system. The Authority is a statutorily created state agency charged with improving the administration of justice within the state; coordinating JAG funds among state and local initiatives; preparing and submitting the state JAG application; administering JAG funds, including establishing funding priorities; distributing funds; monitoring sub-recipients' compliance with all JAG special conditions and provisions; providing ongoing assistance to sub-recipients; submitting quarterly and annual financial status and performance metrics reports; ensuring sub-grantee compliance; and passing through a pre-determined percentage of funds to local jurisdictions; as well as, administering the pass-through of funds from "less than \$10,000 jurisdictions" that were not eligible for a direct award. The Authority is governed by a Board comprised of 25 individuals who have been identified as major stakeholders in criminal justice administration, policy and planning, including the courts, prosecution, defense, victim advocacy, corrections, research and law enforcement communities, and members of the public at large. The Board, through its meetings as a whole and its committees, reviews, analyzes, discusses and defines the Authority's general priorities and specific initiatives as an essential part of both strategic and short term planning.

## **Awards and Data Collection Processes**

The Authority's Governing Board (Board) meets quarterly to provide analysis and discussion of potential gaps within the state's criminal justice system and Authority's efforts to coordinate a response to bridge those gaps. The Authority's Budget Committee also convenes to review and ensure Authority funding aligns with its Strategic Planning Initiative. The Authority staff meets throughout the year with directors, executives and other leaders of Authority funded programs to discuss planning, implementation and performance of those programs.

The Authority funding strategy requires all JAG funding applicants to address defined priority areas; identify need through use of validated statistics; present realistic and measurable goals and objectives; use realistic methods for measuring; present a justifiable budget; demonstrate a history of reliability and responsibility; and, persuasively present a need for funding. Once such funding applicants have been identified, their programs are presented to the Authority Board for evaluation and determination to fund. The Authority Board works to ensure JAG fund distribution is in accordance to the Authority's defined strategy and sub-grantees are held accountable to their stated goals and objectives. Sub-grantees are required to provide a 25 percent match for funded programs; however, due to well-documented budget deficits within local governments throughout Illinois, the Authority may waive match for those applicants that provide substantial proof of their inability to meet the match requirement.

The Authority, through its Federal and State Grants Unit (FSGU), oversees many of the principal federal and state assistance programs in Illinois which relate to the administration of justice. The FSGU, along with the Authority's Research and Analysis Unit (RA), develop program data evaluation reports for funded programs. Sub-grantees are required to collect and submit on a quarterly basis, to the Authority, the data requested in these reports. The FSGU uses

these reports to help identify successful programs and to determine future funding. The FSGU also requires sub-grantees to submit quarterly and final fiscal reports detailing obligations and expenditures. The FSGU uses these reports to ensure sub-grantees are on-track with their program expenditures and are using funds for what they were intended. In addition, sub-grantees are required to collect and submit quarterly data reports as required by the Bureau of Justice Administration's (BJA) Performance Management Tool (PMT). The Authority requires its sub-grantees to submit PMT reports directly to the FSGU for review of completeness and accuracy. The FSGU then enters the sub-grantees' data into the BJA PMT website on a quarterly basis. A sub-grantee that fails to comply with timely submission of PMT reports may have their funding withheld. Authority grantees are typically provided funding in performance periods of no more than 12 months for each award. Equipment grants are typically awarded for a performance period of six months.

### **Strategic Planning Process**

In November 2009, the Authority initiated a comprehensive assessment process to identify challenges and successes within the criminal justice system. Authority staff gathered information from state and local leaders, criminal justice practitioners, policymakers, academic researchers and service providers about the primary issues facing their agencies or jurisdictions and the pressing concerns related to the effective administration of criminal justice related services and sanctions. This multi-tiered process included phone interviews, focus groups and surveys with local and county-level law enforcement, state's attorneys, public defenders, judges, probation and court services officers, and health and human services providers. Authority staff also examined academic literature, state criminal justice and drug policy strategies, and reports and policy statements from major national criminal justice related groups and associations.

In addition, the Authority met with the leaders of existing criminal justice reform initiatives on the issues of mental health and justice, offender reentry, victim services, and corrections reform to ensure the strategic planning process complemented and was informed by work already underway to improve and enhance the adult criminal justice system. Staff also reviewed existing academic and public policy literature about criminal justice policies, practices, and programs. The Authority used this information to craft its 2010 *Smarter Solutions for Crime Reduction Summit* and brought together over 200 criminal justice practitioners, policymakers, legislators, service providers, researchers, and community members for two-days of sessions to discuss and evaluate known problems and strategies occurring in local jurisdictions, statewide. Each session provided information about current strategies that can be replicated or adapted in local jurisdictions, highlighting effective practices that are multidisciplinary in nature and incorporate promising or evidence-based components; highlight professional development or training models; and support innovative information-sharing standards, policies and practices.

From these sessions the Authority developed the following four core premises to apply to its funding recommendations:

- Initiatives should seek to appropriately apply sanctions and services to keep offenders from reoffending. Law enforcement and prosecution must work together to protect public safety. Criminal behavior is sometimes a product of mental health issues or addiction while other offenders present real and significant threat to society. This premise drives funding for projects which recognize a need for both sanctions and services to protect public safety.
- Initiatives should focus efforts according to an offender's risks (e.g.: prior criminal history, homelessness), assets (e.g.: employment, dependent children) and needs (e.g.:"

substance abuse treatment or physical health issues). This premise drives funding for projects that identify strategies which most effectively and efficiently prevent further offending from individuals who pose a low risk to public safety and could therefore be managed by a mixture of community sanctions and services.

- Resources are most efficiently used for initiatives which attempt to replicate evidence-based or promising practices; engage in multi-disciplinary, collaborative, projects; provide for professional development and training; or adopt integrated information sharing systems projects.
- Issues and strategies within the criminal justice system can shift. Resources should be made available to respond to changes in criminal justice policy and practices and advancements in the field.

## **Goals**

The Authority developed the following goals as a result of the 2010 Summit that will guide the Authority through 2015:

Goal I: Improve criminal justice outcomes through the use of promising and evidence-based practices that demonstrate effectiveness.

Goal II: Increase the efficiency of the criminal justice system by optimizing existing resources.

Goal III: Support programs which seek to implement alternatives to corrections by providing services when appropriate.

Goal IV: Support policies and decision making through integrated technology and standardized information sharing across the criminal justice system and with non-criminal justice partners.

The Authority has defined numerous objectives, actions steps and benchmarks toward achieving its stated goals and has initiated a diligent effort to shift its focus toward identifying and funding those programs which use evidence-based or promising practices and form cross-disciplinary and cross jurisdictional partnerships.

### Evidence-based Practices

The National Criminal Justice Association (NCJA) has been driving the discussion on evidence-based practices for state agencies, such as the Authority, that administer the Federal Justice Assistance Grant dollars to state and local criminal justice agencies. NCJA continues to provide the Authority with invaluable guidance to identify the appropriate place for evidence-based practices in a statewide policy.

The Authority recognizes the value of the “gold standard” approach to principles of evidence-based practices; however, such a standard is rarely achieved in criminal justice and human services interventions, and therefore few interventions exist under this label. A more feasible approach to identifying evidence-based practices is through one or more evaluation studies that use a quasi-experimental design, or one in which participants are not randomly assigned and thus, there is no “perfect” comparison group. These practices have been repeatedly shown to achieve positive outcomes and ultimately provide taxpayers and citizens with a good return on their investment.

There are numerous challenges and limitations posed in implementing evidence-based strategies in the exact manner, under the exact conditions necessary for program fidelity. Therefore, the Authority encourages adopting practices that have been assessed through program evaluations or include practices that demonstrate effective outcomes from the existing criminal justice research and technical assistance. Additionally, the Authority recognizes the value of an

organic strategy that is informed by an on-going discussion of evidence-based practices and core components of effectiveness, as the state of knowledge in these areas will continue to evolve.

### Multi-disciplinary Partnerships

The Authority recognizes that criminal activity can be best addressed through collaborative practices that coordinate sanctions and services for offenders. Multi-disciplinary partnerships require a broad array of individuals with broad expertise from different fields to come together to identify a specific problem in the community, analyze the factors contributing to the problem, and implement a program that is tailored to the site-specific crime issue. Advisory boards and steering committees often guide the process to share information, contribute to the overall planning and/or implementation of the program and identify supplemental resources to strengthen the initiative. The Authority values, encourages and coordinates multi-disciplinary partnerships.

In the summer of 2013, the Authority and its governing Board engaged in a planning process to review, refine and revise the priorities set by the 2010 *Smarter Solutions for Crime Reduction Summit*. The priorities developed at the meeting will guide the allocation of JAG funding through 2015.

### **Funding Priorities and Additional Coordination Efforts**

The two-day planning process in 2013 engaged Illinois criminal justice stakeholders, Authority grant and research staff, outside academics, and other interested parties. Among the information presented was the current BJA Byrne/JAG priorities; current and historical ICJIA Byrne/JAG grant funding; other ICJIA grant funding; current crime trends and data; an environmental scan of the Illinois criminal justice system; significant successful criminal justice programs; areas of need within the system; evidence-based and promising practices to address

Illinois needs; areas for collaboration among stakeholders and lessons learned from existing efforts and future research and evaluation efforts that will help inform Illinois criminal justice grant funding and policy

The priorities for funding under the Byrne/JAG program developed through the planning efforts are:

## **1. Law enforcement:**

### Overarching Priority:

Support proven and innovative programs targeted to address recognized risk factors and augment protective factors to reduce recidivism among those already involved in the criminal justice system, those on community supervision, or those incarcerated, allowing them successful community reentry as law-abiding and contributing members of society.

### Subsidiary Priorities:

- Combine reactive “calls-for-service” policing with proactive strategies that are supported by empirical research.
- Employ predictive analytics and “hot spot mapping” to target specific high-crime geographic locations for increased patrol activity and targeted interventions with emphasis on combatting gang and gun violence.
- Identify high-risk offenders for targeted interventions such as the Boston “Pulling Levers” or the Cincinnati Initiative to Reduce Violence (CIRV).
- Increase police-community partnerships in the joint effort to combat social disorder and crime in communities, to promote the cooperation of community members and



organizations with law enforcement and to maintain appropriate standards for law enforcement.

- Expand use of Crisis Intervention Teams in which police partner with local mental health officials and other experts to design comprehensive plans for managing and responding to persons with mental illness.
- Support multi-jurisdictional task forces which provide investigative and enforcement capabilities beyond the capacity of individual local police agencies, especially in the areas of drug enforcement, combatting street gangs and responding to major crimes in smaller local jurisdictions through cooperative efforts.
- Improve the police response to sexual assault through sexual assault response teams that include multidisciplinary partners and that provide for appropriate sharing of information with service providers.
- Support police prevention, and problem-oriented strategies for combatting gun crime, especially gang-related, including enhanced gun tracing programs.

## **2. Courts, Prosecution, Defense and Community Corrections:**

### Overarching Priority:

Support and enhance court initiatives, including specialty courts, that contribute to the effectiveness and efficiency of the criminal justice court system in all its facets—the judiciary, clerks, prosecution, defense, and probation.

Subsidiary Priorities:

- Support coordination and collaboration across the components of the system: courts, prosecution, defense, probation, parole, service providers and community resources, for example, by instituting or enhancing Criminal Justice Coordinating Councils.
- Encourage the development or enhancement of Differential Case Management systems to match case complexity to expected time to disposition.
- Support efforts to make caseloads across components of the system, courts, prosecution, defense, pre-trial and probation consistent with an efficient and effective system of justice.
- Support efforts to expand the use of the validated, risk and needs assessment tool selected by the Risk/Assets/Needs Assessment Task Force beyond the Department of Corrections to other parts of the criminal justice system.
- Focus on strategies to ensure that justice-involved individuals receive evidence-based programming and services that will reduce recidivism rates during and after justice system involvement and for those incarcerated in jail, engage in pre-release planning to transition individuals to community based services.
- Expand the use of Adult Redeploy Illinois (ARI) within existing ARI jurisdictions and to new jurisdictions.
- Bring drug, mental health and veteran's courts to scale in Illinois as required by the Illinois Drug Court Act and as envisioned by the Illinois Mental Health Court Treatment Act.

- Support of the Illinois Center of Excellence for Behavioral Health and Justice (COE) to improve indigent defense services, and to increase access to investigative resources, social workers and other mitigation experts.

### **3. Prevention and Intervention:**

#### Overarching Priority:

Support proven and innovative prevention and intervention programs for young people at risk of involvement in the criminal justice system. These programs should address recognized risk factors, enhance protective factors and help young people avoid involvement with violent crime, drugs, gangs, guns and other criminal behavior. In setting priorities for JAG funding, recognize that ICJIA's primary source of prevention and intervention funds is state violence prevention funding rather than JAG.

#### Subsidiary Priorities:

- Focus resources in geographic areas with concentrations of crime and violence, adopting a public health approach focusing on the health of communities and populations as a whole, to complement the prevention and intervention efforts of the criminal justice system.
- At an individual level, focus resources on those individuals at highest levels of risk for criminal and violent behavior.
- Integrate and utilize validated risk, assets and needs assessment tools throughout every stage of the criminal justice system to identify those individuals at high risk and to identify individual risk and protective factors that might be addressed by programming.

- Focus resources on programs and practices the effectiveness of which has been established by research studies or those innovative programs for which there is support in research and practice.
- Enlist the aid of the community in securing resources that enhance community and individual protective factors and reduce community and individual risk factors.
- Support cross-agency and cross-sector collaborations aimed at prevention and intervention of crime and violence.

#### **4. Priorities for State Corrections:**

##### Overarching Priority:

Support programs which allow state and local correctional facilities to apply proven and innovative programs to assist in meeting the needs of incarcerated persons and to maintain the safety and security of the institution, staff and inmate population.

##### Subsidiary Priorities:

- Integrate and utilize validated risk, assets and needs assessment tools throughout every stage of the criminal justice system to identify those individuals at high risk and to identify individual risk and protective factors that might be addressed by programming.
- Focus resources on those individuals at highest levels of risk for criminal and violent behavior.
- Focus resources on programs and practices the effectiveness of which has been established by research studies or those innovative programs for which there is support in research and practice.

- Expand the availability of programming to address identified needs of offenders across domains that will aid them in desisting from further criminal behavior, with particular emphasis on behavioral health issues such as substance abuse and mental health issues, vocational training, and educational opportunities.
- Begin release planning early in an individual’s stay in the correctional system and focus efforts in the pre-release stage with staff trained to identify and assist with barriers to reentry including transition from corrections-based to community-based services, transitional housing, and employment and vocational services and family and community reintegration.
- Establish electronic data-exchanges with courts, probation, and jails to receive information at intake and to send information to parole, re-entry service providers, and law enforcement at release.
- Increase the use of crisis intervention training to assist correctional officers in responding appropriately to individuals with mental illness.

## **5. Justice Information Sharing:**

### Overarching Priority:

Support efforts to implement integrated justice information systems throughout the state to ensure that each component of the criminal justice system has access to timely, complete, and accurate information necessary to inform decision-making at each stage of the criminal justice process.

### Subsidiary Priorities:

- Support justice information integration efforts at both the state and local level.

- Develop a statewide system integration plan based on national standards.
- Support efforts to bring together criminal justice stakeholders: law enforcement, courts, court clerks, prosecution, defense, pre-trial services, probation, corrections and service providers at state and local level to explore criminal justice information sharing as a collaborative venture, and to make those stakeholders willing partners by demonstrating the business case for how such efforts improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the criminal justice system.
- Support the development of leadership and governance structures, as well as the use of national standards, Global Reference Architecture (GRA), National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) and Global Federated Identity and privilege Management (GFIPM) for such state and local projects.
- Focus efforts on developing a logical progression for such projects, examining policy and governance, business process and operations, systems and technology, facilities and network infrastructure and information technology and resources.
- Support efforts to bring national level technical assistance to state and local information sharing projects.

## **6. Priorities for Recidivism Reduction:**

### Overarching Priority:

Support proven and innovative programs targeted to address recognized risk factors and augment protective factors to reduce recidivism among those already involved in the criminal justice system, those on community supervision, or those incarcerated, allowing them successful community reentry as law-abiding and contributing members of society.

### Subsidiary Priorities:

- At the community level, focus resources on those areas with the highest rates and numbers of individuals subject to probation or returning from the Departments of Corrections and Juvenile Justice.
- At an individual level, focus resources on those system-involved individuals at highest levels of risk for criminal and violent behavior.
- Integrate and utilize validated risk, assets and needs assessment tools throughout every stage of the criminal justice system to identify those individuals at high risk and to identify individual risk and protective factors that might be addressed by programming.
- Focus resources on recidivism reduction programs and practices the effectiveness of which has been established by research studies or those innovative programs for which there is support in research and practice.
- Involve the individual, the individual's family and the community in efforts to reduce recidivism.
- Enlist the aid of the community in securing resources that enhance community and individual protective factors and reduce community and individual risk factors.
- Support cross-agency and cross-sector collaborations aimed at recidivism reduction.

## **7. Justice Research and Evaluation:**

### Overarching Priority:

Support research and other programs that contribute to knowledge about crime, its causes, prevention and deterrence and about the needs of victims, offenders with mental illness and or substance abuse issues, and other special populations to ensure that such knowledge is made available to policy makers and practitioners.

### Subsidiary Priorities:

- Collect, analyze, and publish data that inform the program needs in local jurisdictions as well as the state overall including trends pertaining to 1) crime, 2) risk factors for delinquency and criminality, and 3) criminal justice operations and caseloads.
- Identify evidence-based programs that fall within JAG funding priorities, and compile documentation of critical components of those program models for use by Authority Grants staff to determine fidelity to the model in grant application review.
- Identify performance measures based on program logic models, design grantee data reports to capture those measures, and use resultant data for determining program effectiveness.
- Provide development, training and support for the use of ICJIA's data tools to identify jurisdictions in need of specific program services, and to assist local grant applicants in the preparation of their program proposals.
- Provide specific and extensive research support in key priority areas across the state including crime related to drugs, gangs, and gun violence.
- Provide specific and extensive evaluation support, including cost-benefit analysis where possible, in areas where large allocations of grant funding have been made by the Authority including multijurisdictional drug task forces, community-based violence prevention, community corrections, and problem solving courts.

### **Challenges**

In spite of the good work in place, there is much work to do in Illinois by the Authority to help reduce the cost of justice involvement. In this time of serious fiscal challenges, it is imperative to leverage scarce resources through inter-agency communication and collaboration,



and the fostering of strong partnerships with health and human services organizations that also deal with justice-involved individuals. Currently, there are limited opportunities for criminal justice professionals, health and human services professionals and other interested parties to meet together and develop common goals and approaches regarding issues of mutual interest, particularly that of providing a coordinated system response to offender rehabilitation and reintegration into the community.

Illinois lacks alternatives to secure confinement and has various barriers to diversion for defendants, dependent upon jurisdiction. Such barriers involve judge or prosecutor reluctance, lack of knowledge of available options, standard protocols, a validated pre-trial risk and eligibility assessment tools and collaboration among involved key players. Additionally, many jurisdictions lack appropriate diversion options due to funding cuts and limited treatment spaces.

There continues to be a need to share data about offenders and criminal justice processes available across the various decision points in the criminal justice system and between criminal justice and health and human services when serving the same population. This is a critical component of an efficient and effective criminal justice system. Illinois faces an imbalanced distribution of technical resources and skills, an aging technology infrastructure at many agencies, and other barriers to implementing integrated information systems at the local or state levels. These inadequacies consistently lead to duplication of effort, inaccuracies in essential information, and inefficiencies in sharing information, which in turn increase costs to the justice system. Similarly, Illinois law enforcement must make advances in areas such as mapping and technology and multi-jurisdictional or multi-disciplinary partnerships that can enhance law enforcement objectives, contribute to improved public safety and reduce long-term costs.

## **Conclusion**

The Authority claims an integral role for the Illinois Criminal Justice System in the strategic planning, coordination and administration of JAG and other Federal funding sources. The Authority views its role as significant and will continue to diligently work to fund programs, goals and objectives that align with the JAG program's purpose areas and the state of Illinois' priority criminal justice system issues. The Authority has identified through its 2010 Summit and post-Summit activities the issues within the Illinois Criminal Justice System and is well prepared to coordinate an informed response. The Authority will continue in 2014 to use its resources to identify the state's priority needs and most effective strategies for program implementation. The Authority will continue to allocate priority JAG funding to sub-grantees working to address issues related to Illinois, as well as, provide thorough monitoring of those programs to ensure goals and objectives achievement and proper use of JAG funding.

The Authority recognizes that the best plans are organic and through grant monitoring, analysis of evidence-based practices, and future planning and coordination efforts with its local and state stakeholders will rapidly respond to address the criminal justice systems often changing needs and priorities. In addition, the Authority values its relationship with BJA and will continue to adhere to its performance measurement data collection, reporting mechanisms, financial regulations and special conditions throughout the duration of the grant.