

**Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Public Safety & Security
Office of Grants & Research**



**Edward J. Byrne Memorial
Justice Assistance Grant**

**Federal Fiscal Year 2024 - 2028
Massachusetts Strategic Plan**

**Maura T. Healey
Governor**

**Kimberley Driscoll
Lieutenant Governor**

**Terrence M. Reidy
Secretary**

**Kevin J. Stanton
Executive Director**

Introduction

The Executive Office of Public Safety and Security (EOPSS) is responsible for the policy development and budgetary oversight of the secretariat agencies, independent programs, and several boards which aid in crime prevention, homeland security preparedness, and ensuring the safety of residents and visitors in the Commonwealth. The agencies that fall under EOPSS are:

- Massachusetts State Police
- Massachusetts Emergency Management Agency
- Sex Offender Registry Board
- Department of Fire Services
- Department of Criminal Justice Information Services
- Department of Correction
- Parole Board
- Office of the Chief Medical Examiner
- State 911 Department
- Massachusetts State Police Crime Lab
- Municipal Police Training Committee
- Massachusetts National Guard
- **Office of Grants and Research**
- Massachusetts Public Safety Broadband Office

The Office of Grants and Research (OGR) serves as the State Administering Agency (SAA) for federal funds received from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Homeland Security and Department of Justice. Annually, OGR also manages millions of dollars in funds appropriated from the Massachusetts State Legislature that support a wide array of criminal justice and public safety type initiatives. In addition to securing, managing and administering grant funding, the OGR has a Research Policy and Analysis Division that collects and analyzes data to inform grant funded priorities as well as assist in shaping public safety policy. In line with the Bureau of Justice Assistance's (BJA) priorities for evidence-based programming and strategic planning, OGR continually evaluates its current planning process as it relates to the allocation of Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) funding. The goals of the OGR include:

- Improving community safety and local preparedness by providing resources to communities based on need;
- Investing in evidence-based, innovative programs;
- Granting awards based on national and state priorities;
- Fostering collaboration across jurisdictions by delivering grant dollars with a regional approach;
- Making funding decisions based upon research, empirical data, and best practices; and
- Ensuring the grant awarding process is transparent; and in compliance with federal and state guidelines.

2024 – 2028 Strategic Plan

This document serves as the Commonwealth of Massachusetts' FFY 2024-2028 five-year Edward Byrne Memorial JAG Strategic Plan. There are no changes to the implementation of the plan from last year, the second year of the five-year plan. Over the past several years, OGR has improved its grant making policies and procedures, enhanced communications, provided personalized technical assistance and quicker response time to sub-recipients, and standardized the reimbursement documentation process and forms required of sub-recipients. Furthermore, it is paramount to OGR to improve upon and implement systems that ensure transparency and accountability in awarding and monitoring all federal and state grant funds. Sub-recipients are required to report quarterly on programmatic progress and financial expenditures. In addition, the required performance metrics data are reported quarterly by sub-recipients using the BJA Performance Measurement Tool.

In addition to our strategic planning efforts to make informed decisions regarding priorities and allocations, particularly for the state set aside portion of JAG funds, OGR will continue to assess its public safety agencies' needs as well as participate in the Special Commission on Criminal Justice and participate in the Council of State Government state-related endeavors. JAG project identifiers associated with proposed project activities are:

- Crime Prevention,
- Drug Offenders,
- Equipment,
- Gangs,
- Officer Safety,
- Policing,
- Reentry,
- Research,
- Substance Abuse Treatment; and
- Violence Against Women.

In addition to the JAG Program, OGR administers several other state and federal criminal justice grant programs with purposes that complement the proposed JAG initiatives (e.g., state-funded programs for youth and gang violence prevention, the distribution of sexual assault evidence collection kits). OGR is the SAA for funding from the United States Department of Justice (DOJ), BJA, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), the Office on Violence Against Women (VAWA), and the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS). OGR is also the SAA for federal funds from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) and Department of Homeland Security (DHS). These grant programs are centralized under OGR in order to provide a unified and coordinated approach for the criminal justice and public safety needs of the Commonwealth.

All JAG funded programs support the overall goal to improve public safety and the quality of life in Massachusetts. OGR is currently managing contracts to sub-recipients which support

programs that focus on youth violence prevention, smart policing, gangs, substance abuse, reentry, victims of domestic violence and sexual assault, homeland security, highway safety, school safety, technology, and research. It is anticipated that JAG funding will continue to support evidence-based, innovative, and promising programs and practices statewide.

In line with the BJA's priorities for evidence-based programming and strategic planning, OGR continually evaluates its current planning process as it relates to the allocation of JAG funding. OGR understands the importance of strategic planning and the replication of evidence-based programs and is committed to doing so with our FY24 - 28 JAG awards.

The strategic planning process represents an exceptional level of coordination and collaboration among state and local partners, including our 18-member JAG Strategic Planning Committee, consisting of representatives from all segments of the criminal justice system, including judges, prosecutors, law enforcement personnel, corrections personnel, providers of indigent defense services, victim services, juvenile justice and delinquency prevention programs, community corrections, and reentry services. For a complete list of Stakeholders, please see Appendix A.

The JAG Strategic Planning Committee played a crucial role in the development and completion of the FFY24-28 Byrne JAG strategic plan. Members of the committee utilized their experiences and expertise in their given field to participate in webinars and provide critical feedback that enabled OGR to formulate the most efficient and effective strategic plan that addressed the most pressing needs and filling in gaps where resources are so desperately needed. Committee members provided unique and innovative ideas and views that were incorporated into the strategic plan.

Through our strategic planning process which included the use of data, a stakeholder survey, and collaboration with our JAG Strategic Planning Committee, six state-identified priorities were chosen for our FFY24-28 Byrne JAG application. OGR will address its JAG funding priority areas by implementing JAG funded programs that include evidence-based, proven effective programs and practices, innovative ideas, and creative solutions. OGR will also promote regionalism, research-based policy, and rational decision-making via an open and public competitive grant process that ensures the distribution of funds geographically and across disciplines within JAG purpose areas.

Massachusetts intends to utilize FFY24-28 JAG funds for specific activities to prevent and control crime and to improve the criminal justice system in keeping with the allowable JAG purposes and our identified JAG priorities. OGR will utilize 10% of the funding for grant administration purposes, meet the required variable pass through percentage (VPT) and less than \$10,000 jurisdictions, and allocate the remaining funds towards State initiatives which will primarily benefit our state criminal justice related enforcement agencies.

Permissible uses of JAG funds in general are:

- Law enforcement programs
- Prosecution and court programs
- Prevention and education programs

- Corrections and community corrections programs
- Drug treatment and enforcement programs
- Planning, evaluation, and technology improvement programs
- Crime victim and witness programs (other than compensation)
- Mental health programs and related law enforcement and corrections programs

The Commonwealth will maintain focus on the following priorities identified through the strategic planning process:

- Reducing Gun, Gang & Youth Violence
- Support evidence Based Reentry Programs to Reduce Recidivism
- Preventing and addressing domestic violence and sexual assault,
- Combatting Heroin, Opioids & Other Illegal Drugs
- Collaborative Prosecution & Prevention Programs
- Utilizing Research to Assess the Effectiveness of Byrne JAG Programs

Ultimately, all JAG allocations will be based on an assessment of the relative public safety and criminal justice needs of the Commonwealth, as determined by the Governor and Secretary of Public Safety and Security, and informed by the statewide strategic planning process, undertaken in part by the JAG Strategic Planning Committee, Special Commission on Criminal Justice and local law enforcement officials that represent our local units of government.

As part of this statewide planning effort, OGR invited a wide variety of stakeholders to become members of the JAG Strategic Planning Committee to assist in the design and implementation of the Commonwealth's FFY24-28 JAG Strategic Plan. This Committee includes stakeholders from throughout the criminal justice system, including law enforcement, prosecutors, providers of indigent defense services, judges, corrections personnel, victim services, juvenile justice and delinquency prevention programs, community corrections and reentry services.

The overall goal of the JAG strategic planning process was to set the state's priorities, coordinate efforts, and determine funding allocations within JAG. In order to do this, OGR also identified funding administered not only by OGR, but also the Executive Office of Health and Human Services (EOHHS), Office of Attorney General for Massachusetts, and The United States Attorney's Office for the District of Massachusetts. Grants identified, but not limited to:

- Project Safe Neighborhoods (PSN)
- Victims of Crime Act (VOCA)
- Byrne (SCIP)
- Adam Walsh Act Implementation Program (AWA)
- National Criminal History Improvement Program (NCHIP)
- Safe and Successful Youth Initiative (SSYI)
- Title II Formula Grant Program
- National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) Grant

- Residential Substance Abuse Treatment (RSAT)
- Violence Against Women Act (VAWA)

Due to the research and collaboration, we engaged in during our strategic planning process, we are able to identify priority areas for our JAG funds that will not duplicate efforts from the initiatives and agencies listed above. If anything, some of our JAG funded initiatives will complement those initiatives.

Byrne JAG Stakeholder Survey Development/Methodology

OGR's RPAD developed a survey to capture information from traditional and non-traditional partners across the state to inform the strategic planning effort. The survey aimed to provide additional input and assist the SAA with: 1) prioritizing Byrne Justice Assistance Grant purpose areas for funding, 2) prioritizing initiatives within the eight JAG purpose areas, and 3) understanding respondents' experiences with previous JAG funding.

Given that a person's role and geography in the criminal justice system likely influences funding priorities, the survey was designed to capture information from each respondent about their agency's function within the criminal justice system and agency service area. This allows us to view results across a number of groups and dimensions, thus enhancing our understanding of the survey responses.

OGR launched the survey on June 4, 2024. An introductory email with a link to the survey was distributed to the following agencies/entities in Massachusetts:

- Executive Office of the Trial Court
- Supreme Judicial Court
- Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) within the Executive Office of Health and Human Services
- Committee for Public Counsel Services
- Department of Correction
- Department of Youth Services
- District Attorneys Association
- Parole Board
- Probation Services and Office of Community Corrections
- Sheriffs' Association
- Attorney General's Office
- Chiefs of municipal and state police departments
- Massachusetts Association of Crime Analysts
- Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee
- Community Resources for Justice, and
- Massachusetts Institute for a New Commonwealth (MassINC).

OGR grant managers emailed the survey introduction and link to contacts for a variety of grant programs including:

- Bulletproof Vest Program
- Emerging Adults Reentry Initiative (EARI)
- Homeland Security Advisory Councils (HSAC)
- Byrne JAG
- Residential Substance Abuse Treatment Program
- Restorative Justice Program
- Shannon Community Safety Initiative
- Traffic Enforcement and STEP (Sustained Traffic Enforcement)
- Municipal Public Safety Staffing Grant (MUNI)
- Violence Against Women Act (VAWA), Services, Training, Officers, Prosecutors (STOP)

OGR strived to reach survey respondents that were not directly solicited through our email distribution and contact lists through snowball sampling, (asking survey recipients to pass along the survey link to others in their field).

The survey closed on June 19, 2024 at 5:00 pm with 289 responses. The survey consisted of five sections (see Appendix B survey instrument; separate attachment). Initial compilation of the data revealed that the number of responses dropped with each new section of the survey. A breakdown of the number of survey responses by section is shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1. JAG Stakeholder Survey Sections and Questions with Number of Responses

Section Heading	Questions	Number of Responses
Agency Role/Geographic Coverage	1-4	289
Data and Technology	5-8	287
Prioritizing Federal JAG Purpose Areas	9-19	265
JAG Application/Funding History	20-24	249
Additional Comments	25	41

In the ensuing discussion of the survey results, the number of respondents (n) is provided in the title of each depicted table or graph. The survey results are very informative and discussed in this report. The most relevant survey questions, with aggregate data and highlights are presented in the analyses.

A larger part of the overall program design revolves around a major overhaul of the Massachusetts criminal justice system. Massachusetts is undergoing major criminal justice reform involving stakeholders in a myriad of planning and development efforts. Some of the changes outlined in the 177-page bill¹ are:

¹ Massachusetts underwent a systematic review of their criminal justice system, working with the Council of State Governments Justice Center, culminating in the enactment of Chapter 69 of the Acts of 2018, also known as the criminal justice reform bill, April 13, 2018.

- Enhance programming available in prisons and jails;
- Enhance community supervision and expand behavioral health resources;
- Encourage district attorneys to create and use diversion programs for special populations including veterans, persons with mental illness, and those with substance abuse issues;
- Increase penalties for trafficking of fentanyl and carfentanil, and repeat drunk driving; and
- Implement a number of juvenile justice provisions.

An inter-branch, interagency oversight board meets to monitor and ensure implementation of the justice reinvestment policies, and the new legislation mandates a number of additional special commissions and advisory boards. These boards and commissions empower the Secretary of Public Safety and Security and other criminal justice leadership positions to implement the necessary changes outlined in the law.

OGR at times utilizes outside reviewers from a cross section of criminal justice, victim services, public safety stakeholders, and community-based agencies who read and evaluate proposals for JAG funding and make recommendations to EOPSS regarding awards. Furthermore, EOPSS and OGR have a number of advisory councils that include these and other groups that provide stakeholder input on policy and resource allocation, including the following:

- Forensic Sciences Advisory Board
- Medico Legal Commission
- Criminal Justice Information Services
- Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee
- Municipal Police Training Committee
- State 911 Commission
- Regional Homeland Security Councils

OGR is engaged in numerous activities that promote multi-agency collaboration and program coordination relative to the JAG Program. These collaborations range from partnerships with other federal, state, and local criminal justice agencies and coordination with state and federal grant programs. The following are a few examples of ongoing coordination efforts in which OGR participates:

- Special Commission to Study the Criminal Justice System;
- Pediatric Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner (Pedi-SANE) Advisory Committee;
- Governor's Council to Address Sexual Assault and Domestic Violence;
- Violence Against Women Act Advisory Committee;
- Massachusetts Chiefs of Police Association;
- Massachusetts Sheriffs' Association;
- Massachusetts District Attorney Association;
- Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative;
- Governor's Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee (OJJDP State Advisory Group).

The above collaborations, as well as many more not listed, are part of a much larger strategic plan that results in the funding and implementation of evidence-based, proven effective programs

throughout the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Each program addresses a specific need and fills in gaps for the types of services identified through this immense collaborative effort.

By fostering collaboration and program coordination, and through a combination of state and federal funding, OGR provides a comprehensive portfolio of grant programs for which public and private agencies and municipalities may apply. A primary example of this is the legislatively mandated and funded anti-gang, youth violence grant, Charles E. Shannon Jr. Community Safety Initiative (Shannon Grant CSI), which has awarded approximately \$120 million to local communities and research partners since state fiscal year 2009. In order to combat youth violence, the grant requires collaborative relationships be developed and strengthened among police, prosecutors, human service agencies, and community service providers.

As the SAA for numerous federal and state grant initiatives, OGR personnel are well-versed in the strategic planning process and the funding of evidence-based programs that have been implemented successfully over many years by JAG, VAWA, and RSAT subgrantees, as well as state-funded Shannon grantees.

The Commonwealth, through OGR, continues to engage in numerous activities designed to promote multi-agency collaboration and program coordination to address JAG priorities. By fostering collaboration and program coordination, OGR provides a comprehensive portfolio of grant programs. Annually, several million dollars in federal and state funds are disbursed statewide for public safety and criminal justice-related purposes.

Some of our more recent and effective federal and state funded programs are/were:

- Byrne JAG Local Law Enforcement Equipment and Technology Grant
- State Funded PSN Projects
- Federally funded PSN
- National Criminal History Improvement Program (NCHIP)
- Human Trafficking Grant Program
- Shannon CSI
- Bulletproof Vest Program
- Reentry
- Restorative Justice

In order to best serve the constituents of Massachusetts, EOPSS and OGR work in partnership with numerous state and local agencies to address widespread public safety concerns that impact the Commonwealth.

Throughout the entire planning process members of the committee were fully vested in identifying and approving the State's priorities for JAG funding. This involved numerous hours reviewing and interpreting data, analyzing the summary results of the survey (see Appendix B), researching existing programs and identifying gaps in service, and providing OGR with comments and suggestions when reviewing the draft plan. Stakeholders were engaged from start to finish, providing valuable time, resources and expertise to the formulation and completion of the plan. Thanks to the invaluable contributions by the committee members, Massachusetts has put forward a strategic plan that will provide funding to the identified priority areas that will have the largest impact on the issues each area is facing.

Crime Statistics

TOTAL PART I ARREST RATES BY OFFENSE TYPE

The FBI tracks data on Part I Adult (18 years and over) offenses, which consist of property crime: burglary, larceny, motor vehicle theft, and arson; and violent crimes: homicide, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault. As show in Figure 1 below, Massachusetts' Part I adult arrest rates notably declined over a ten-year period, dropping 33% between 2014 and 2023. Despite the considerable reduction in arrests over time, there was a slight uptick in recent years. In 2023, the adult arrest rate rose 6% from the previous year.




Figure 1: Total Adult Arrest Rates, 18 years and over (MA Summary and NIBRS), obtained through the Crime Solv Database, September 2024

Figure 2 displays trends for Massachusetts adults arrested for crimes against persons and property over a 10-year period. Between 2014 and 2023, violent crime arrest rates remained steady over time. There was a slight decrease (1%) in violent crime rates in 2023 compared to 2022. Unlike violent crime arrest rates, property crime rates dramatically dropped (49%) between 2014 and 2023. However, compared to 2022, property crime rates increased 15% in 2023.




Figure 2: Adult Arrest Rates, Violent Crimes and Property Crimes (MA Summary Arrestee Data and NIBRS) 18 and over, obtained through Crime Solv Database, September 2024

PART I: TOTAL JUVENILE ARREST RATES BY OFFENSE TYPE

Figure 3 displays the Part I Massachusetts' juvenile arrest rates over a ten-year period. The offense categories include murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle-theft and arson. Between 2014 and 2023, there was a 23% decrease in juvenile arrest rates. Similar to trends with adult arrest rates, juvenile arrests rates increased in recent years, climbing 13% between 2022 and 2023.




Figure 3: Part I, Total Juvenile Arrest Rates (MA Summary and Arrestees Data), obtained through Crime Solv Database, June 2024

Part I: Juvenile Arrest Rates by Offense Categories: Violent Crime Arrests and Property Crime Arrests

Upon further examination of the trends for Massachusetts juveniles arrested for crimes against persons and property, arrest rates for violent crimes increased 13%, whereas arrest rates for property crimes decreased by 42% (Figure 4). More recently, violent and property crimes increased between 2022 and 2023, 10% and 17% respectively.




Figure 4: Juvenile Arrest Rates by Offense Categories (MA Summary and NIBRS), obtained through the Crime Solv Database, June 2024

Survey Results

Respondent's Role/Geographic Coverage

Q1: Identify your agency/organization's role in the criminal justice system. (Specify up to three roles indicating top choice (most relevant) as “First Choice”, second choice as “Second Choice”, and third-choice as “Third Choice”.




Figure 5. Source: Massachusetts Research and Policy Analysis Division, JAG Stakeholder Survey, June 2024.

Role with less than 5 responses (not included): Parole (2).

- The survey had a heavy law enforcement response, with 82% of respondents listing law enforcement as one of their top 3 agency roles (228 respondents as #1).
- Due to the over-representation of responses from law enforcement, survey results are grouped into three categories by role in the CJ system: 1) law enforcement, 2) criminal justice agencies, and 3) human services agencies. Survey responses are viewed through this lens, providing a more balanced view of the data and adjust for the heavy law enforcement response.

Q2: Select the area in which you work (Select one response).




Figure 6. Source: Massachusetts Research and Policy Analysis Division, JAG Stakeholder Survey, June 2024.

As shown in Figure 6:

- 80.3% of respondents work for local (municipal) government.
- 8.7% of respondents work for state government.
- 7.3% of respondents work in the non-profit sector.
- 2.1% of respondents worked in “other” areas including college/university campus law enforcement (4), commercial and intel work (1), and health care (1).
- 1.7% of respondents work in the private sector.




Figure 7. Source: Massachusetts Research and Policy Analysis Division, JAG Stakeholder Survey, June 2024.

- Figure 7 reveals that local government responses were heavily represented by law enforcement agencies (94.8%).
- More than three-quarters (76%) of state government responses were criminal justice agencies.
- Responses from the non-profit sector were mainly from human services agencies (95.5%).

Q3: Identify the Massachusetts counties where your agency provides services. (If your agency serves the whole state, select STATE as your response).




Figure 8. Source: Massachusetts Research and Policy Analysis Division, JAG Stakeholder Survey, June 2024.

- Of the 289 respondents, 267 (92.9%) selected one response option, and 22 respondents selected multiple areas:
- 13 counties in Massachusetts are represented in the responses:
 - Middlesex county, the state's most populous county, was selected most often (56), followed by Worcester (51), the county with the second highest population.
 - Nantucket county, which has the fewest residents of any county, was not selected as a response. Dukes county, which has the second fewest residents, was selected only once.
- Twenty agencies responded that they provide services to the state (or provide coverage to each county in the state):
 - Of those, about two-thirds (65.0%) were from criminal justice agencies.

Q4: Describe the area(s) served by your agency (select one response).




Figure 9. Source: Massachusetts Research and Policy Analysis Division, JAG Stakeholder Survey, June 2024.

Within each agency group, the distribution of service area varies widely (Figure 9):

- 41.9% of the law enforcement agencies served primarily suburban areas. The law enforcement agencies are fairly evenly distributed across primarily rural, primarily urban, and mixed urban and rural areas.
- Human services agencies serviced mostly suburban areas, followed by urban, and mixed urban and rural.

- 66.7% of the criminal justice agencies served mixed urban/rural areas, with 12.5% primarily urban.

Data and Technology

Q5: Accurate data is essential for data-driven decision making. Do you feel your agency has adequate resources for data access/management/analysis and information sharing? (select one response)

Table 3. Does Agency have Adequate Resources for Data Access/Management/Analysis and Information Sharing? (n = 287)		
	Number	Percent
Yes	183	63.8%
No	87	30.3%
Do Not Know	16	5.6%
Other (specify)	1	0.4%
Total	287	100%




Figure 10. Source: Massachusetts Research and Policy Analysis Division, JAG Stakeholder Survey, June 2024.

- 63.8% of respondents reported their agency has adequate resources for data access, management, analysis and information sharing (Table 3).
- When broken down by agency group, respondents from human services agencies had the highest percentage of affirmative responses (77.1%), followed by those from law enforcement agencies (64.9%).

- More than half of the respondents from criminal justice agencies felt their agency did not have adequate data resources (54.2%).

Q6: Does your agency have access to electronic data to help you plan, evaluate your program, and/or determine outcomes? (select one response)

Table 4. Does Agency Have Electronic Data for Planning, Evaluation, and Determining Outcomes? (n = 280)		
	Number	Percent
No Access to Electronic Data	11	3.9%
Have Automated Data - Easy to Access Information	136	48.4%
Have Automated Data - Difficult to Access Information	112	39.9%
Do Not Know	20	7.1%
Other (Specify)	1	0.7%
Total	280	100%

- Table 4 shows 3.9% of survey respondents stated their agency does not have access to electronic data and almost 40% said they have access to electronic data, but it is difficult to access information.
- Conversely, nearly half (48.4%) of respondents reported their agency has easy access to electronic data to help plan, evaluate their program, and/or determine outcomes.




Figure 11. Source: Massachusetts Research and Policy Analysis Division, JAG Stakeholder Survey, June 2024.

Figure 11 shows this information by agency group and is discussed below:

- Automated data is easy to access for research, planning, and outcome measurement:
 - 48.9% of the law enforcement group
 - 62.9% of the human services agency group
 - 22.7% of the criminal justice agency group
- Agency data is not automated:
 - 5.7% of the human services group
 - 4.6% for the criminal justice agency group
 - 3.6% for law enforcement agency group
- Agency has automated data, but it is difficult to access for planning, evaluation, and outcomes:
 - 50% for the criminal justice agency group
 - 42.2% for law enforcement group
 - 20% for human services group

Q7: If your agency does not have adequate technology resources or access to the data you need, what is your most pressing technology or information sharing need?

- 123 of the 280 respondents (43.9%) stated their agency does not have adequate technology resources or easy access to the data they need. The most pressing technology or information sharing needs are grouped and displayed below. Improved Record Management System (RMS) and/or Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) system, technology which included improved physical technology in the workplace such as computers and tablets, and data access were cited as the most pressing need areas.




Figure 12. Source: Massachusetts Research and Policy Analysis Division, JAG Stakeholder Survey, June 2024.

Data Access: Access to cross-agency reports, interagency data, crime data, MVA & traffic information, other states' and federal criminal record data, and better state run data/information websites that collect, analyze and dispense data.
Data Accuracy: Quality of data being received, accurate data is correct and free from errors.
Data Analytics: Advanced data analysis capabilities; crime-mapping capabilities; increased ability to analyze different forms of data; and specialized research support.
Data Management: ability to clean and check data, increased data security, increased data storage, and increased data consistency.
Improved RMS/CAD: Updated Record Management System and/or Computer-Aided Dispatch System
Software: Improved software; continued licensing; software training; and streamlined software to access data.
Staffing: Hiring and retention of agency staff, having the number and type of employees needed.
Technology: Improved physical technology in the workplace including tablets and computers.

Figure 12 shows the most pressing technology or information sharing need categories by agency group. 'Not Applicable' responses were not included. Responses were categorized into 'Not Applicable' when respondents wrote in the response "not applicable" or responded that their agency has adequate technology resources and access to the data they need.

Q8: Select all the justice system partners that exchange data electronically with your agency (this would not include exchange of data via email). If you do not exchange data electronically with another agency, please select 'We do not exchange electronic information with our partners'.




Figure 13. Source: Massachusetts Research and Policy Analysis Division, JAG Stakeholder Survey, June 2024. Exchange of data electronically via email is not included. The category "Community Services" includes behavioral health, housing, employment, and benefit eligibility.

The responses in Figure 13 reflect a high frequency of data exchange between agencies and one or more criminal justice partners:

- 7.5 out of 10 respondents report their agency exchanges data with law enforcement (75.3%)
- 6 out of 10 exchange data with dispatch (62.8%)
- 5.5 out of 10 exchange data with courts (58.7%)
- 3.5 out of 10 exchange data with probation (38.5%)

Conversely, 9.4% of respondents reported their agency did not exchange data with justice system partners.

Prioritized Federal JAG Purpose Areas and Initiatives

Q9: Other than general program funding, select the top 3 areas of need for Purpose Area 1 - Law Enforcement Programs




Figure 14. Source: Massachusetts Research and Policy Analysis Division, JAG Stakeholder Survey, June 2024.

For JAG Purpose Area 1 - Law Enforcement Programs, the most reported top 3 choices are displayed in Figure 14 and highlighted below:

- Law enforcement:
 - #1 Equipment (19.9%)
 - #2 Training (19.5%)
 - #3 Crisis intervention/mental health/suicide prevention (19.2%)
- Criminal justice agencies:
 - #1 Training (25%)
 - #2 Equipment (15%)

- #3 Drug Enforcement (10%), Gang Enforcement (10%), Workforce/Hire and Retain Qualified Staff (10%), and Other (10%)
- Human services agencies:
 - #1 Training (29.6%)
 - #2 Equipment (18.5%)
 - #3 Crisis intervention/mental health/suicide prevention (14.8%)

Overall, equipment and training were one of the top three need areas for law enforcement programs for all three agency groups. Additionally, crisis intervention/mental health/suicide prevention was also ranked as a top three need area by respondents from two out of three agency groups.

Q10: Within the law enforcement purpose area, select up to three types of equipment most needed in your community.




Figure 15. Source: Massachusetts Research and Policy Analysis Division, JAG Stakeholder Survey, June 2024.

- 15.3% of respondents (n = 35) reported this question was not applicable to their agency.
- Of the 229 respondents that answered:
 - The most identified equipment need is radios, accessories, repeaters/repeater antenna (this was one of the top three choices for 59% of the respondents).

- License plate reader and mobile data terminals and accessories were also identified as most needed by respondents (39.3% and 35.8%, respectively).
- Digital ticketing, ‘Other’, and fingerprint scanner were the equipment least often identified as needed.

Q11: Other than general program funding, select the top 3 areas of need for Purpose Area 2 - Prosecution, Court, Defense and Indigent Defense.




Figure 16. Source: Massachusetts Research and Policy Analysis Division, JAG Stakeholder Survey, June 2024.

Figure 16 shows that within the prosecution, court, defense, and indigent defense program area, specialty courts were consistently ranked in the top three needs. Training was also in the top two for law enforcement and human services groups.

- Law enforcement:
 - #1 Specialty courts (23.1%)
 - #2 Training – court/prosecution/defense (19.7%)
 - #3 Gun/violent crime/gang prosecution (11.1%)
- Criminal justice agencies:

- #1 Court technologies (23.1%)
- #2 Indigent defense (19.2%), Workforce/staff hiring (19.2%)
- #3 Specialty courts (15.4%)
- Human services agencies:
 - #1 Specialty courts (20%), Property and white-collar crime prosecution (20%), Training – court/prosecution/defense (20%)
 - #2 Workforce/staff hiring (13.3%)
 - #3 Indigent defense (6.7%), Gun/violent crime/gang prosecution (6.7%), Court technologies (6.7%), ‘Other’ (6.7%)

Q12: Other than general program funding, please select the top 3 areas of need for Purpose Area 3 - Prevention and Education.




Figure 17. Source: Massachusetts Research and Policy Analysis Division, JAG Stakeholder Survey, June 2024.

As shown in Figure 17, within the prevention and education purpose area, substance use prevention was the top ranked need for the criminal justice and law enforcement groups. Youth mentoring and school violence prevention were in the top 3 areas of need for all three groups.

- Law enforcement:
 - #1 Substance abuse prevention (25%)
 - #2 School violence prevention (22%)
 - #3 Youth mentoring (14.8%)
- Criminal justice agencies:
 - #1 Substance use prevention (27.8%)
 - #2 Gang prevention (16.7%), Youth mentoring (16.7%)
 - #3 Juvenile delinquency prevention (11.1%), School violence prevention (11.1%), 'Other' (11.1%)
- Human services agencies:
 - #1 Suicide prevention (20.6%)
 - #2 Teen dating/domestic violence prevention (17.5%)
 - #3 School violence prevention (15.9%), Youth mentoring (15.9%)

Q13: Other than general program funding, please select the top 3 areas of need for Purpose Area 4 - Corrections/Community Corrections.




Figure 18. Source: Massachusetts Research and Policy Analysis Division, JAG Stakeholder Survey, June 2024.

As revealed in Figure 18, substance use or mental health treatment for incarcerated individuals ranked as the top area within the corrections/community corrections purpose area. Additionally, all three agencies ranked reentry as one of their top 3 need areas.

- Law enforcement:
 - #1 Diversion/alternatives to incarceration (22.2%)
 - #2 Substance use or mental health treatment for incarcerated individuals (18.5%)
 - #3 Reentry (14.8%), Chronic health conditions/outside medical/medications/access to prescribers (14.8%)
- Criminal justice agencies:
 - #1 Reentry (33.3%), Substance use or mental health treatment for incarcerated individuals (33.3%)
 - #2 Workforce/hire and retain qualified staff (14.3%)

- #3 Diversion/alternatives to incarceration (4.8%), Special population programming (4.8%), Smart probation/parole (4.8%), Housing/employment for formerly incarcerated individuals/transitional living (4.8%)
- Human services agencies:
 - #1 Substance use or mental health treatment for incarcerated individuals (33.3%)
 - #2 Diversion/alternatives to incarceration (16.7%), Reentry (16.7%), Special population programming (16.7%), Workforce/hire and retain qualified staff (16.7%)

Q14: Other than general program funding, please select the top 3 areas of need for Purpose Area 5 - Drug Treatment and Enforcement.




Figure 19. Source: Massachusetts Research and Policy Analysis Division, JAG Stakeholder Survey, June 2024.

As shown in Figure 19, all three agency groups ranked co-occurring mental illness or other chronic health conditions as a top need area for purpose area 5. The human services and criminal justice groups ranked community-based/outpatient treatment, community-based detox/crisis intervention center, and workforce/hire and retain qualified staff as top need areas.

- Law enforcement:
 - #1 Multijurisdictional drug enforcement partnerships (20.1%)
 - #2 Drug recognition experts or trained canines (17.7%)
 - #3 Co-occurring mental illness or other chronic health conditions (14.8%)
- Criminal justice agencies:
 - #1 Co-occurring mental illness or other chronic health conditions (22.2%)
 - #2 Secure/corrections-based treatment (16.7%), Workforce/hire and retain qualified staff (16.7%)
 - #3 Community-based/outpatient treatment (11.1%), Community-based detox/crisis intervention center (11.1%), Sober housing for formerly incarcerated individuals (11.1%)
- Human services agencies:
 - #1 Community-based/outpatient treatment (20%), Detox/crisis stabilization (20%)
 - #2 Community-based detox/crisis intervention center (16.7%)
 - #3 Workforce/hire and retain qualified staff (10%), Co-occurring mental illness or other chronic health conditions (10%)

Q15: Other than general program funding, please select the top 3 areas of need for Purpose Area 6 - Planning, Evaluation, and Technology.




Figure 20. Source: Massachusetts Research and Policy Analysis Division, JAG Stakeholder Survey, June 2024.

As shown in Figure 20, Strategic planning/determining priorities was in the top three need areas for all three agency groups. Also, two out of three agency groups identified strategic planning/determining priorities, criminal records improvement, automated information sharing - justice system partners, automated information sharing - community services, and developing outcome measures/ program evaluation and research as one of their top three need areas.

- Law enforcement:
 - #1 Strategic planning/determining priorities (20.4%)
 - #2 Criminal records improvement (18.9%)
 - #3 Automated information sharing - justice system partners (18.4%)
- Criminal justice agencies:
 - #1 Developing outcome measures/program evaluation and research (22.2%)
 - #2 Automated information sharing - justice system partners (19.4%), Strategic

planning/determining priorities (19.4%)

- #3 Automated information sharing - community services (16.7%)

- Human services agencies:

- #1 Strategic planning/determining priorities (33.3%)
- #2 Developing outcome measures/program evaluation and research (25%)
- #3 Criminal records improvement (11.1%), Automated information sharing - community services (11.1%)

Q16: Other than general program funding, please select the top 3 areas of need for Purpose Area 7 - Crime Victim and Witness.




Figure 21. Source: Massachusetts Research and Policy Analysis Division, JAG Stakeholder Survey, June 2024.

Within the crime victim and witness purpose area, a top need identified by respondents from all three agency groups was behavioral/mental health services/trauma-informed care (Figure 21). Two out of three agency groups identified direct victim services/witness intimidation, population-specific services, and community-based/system-based victim witness advocate as top three areas of need.

- Law enforcement:
 - #1 Behavioral/mental health services/trauma-informed care (24.8%)
 - #2 Children exposed to violence, abuse, neglect (15%)
 - #3 Community-based/system-based victim witness advocate (10.8%)
- Criminal justice agencies:
 - #1 Restorative justice initiatives (18.5%)
 - #2 Population-specific services (14.8%)
 - #3 Direct victim services/witness intimidation (11.1%), Automated victim notification (11.1%), Human trafficking (11.1%), Behavioral/mental health services/trauma-informed care (11.1%)
- Human services agencies:
 - #1 Behavioral/mental health services/trauma-informed care (25.6%)
 - #2 Population-specific services (15.4%), Community-based/system-based victim witness advocate (15.4%)
 - #3 Direct victim services/witness intimidation (12.8%)

Q17: Other than general program funding, please select the top 3 areas of need for Purpose Area 8 - Mental Health Programs and related law enforcement and corrections programs, including behavioral programs and crisis intervention teams.




Figure 22. Source: Massachusetts Research and Policy Analysis Division, JAG Stakeholder Survey, June 2024.

Figure 22 shows the top three need areas for purpose area 8, mental health programs and related law enforcement and corrections programs (including behavioral programs and crisis intervention teams). Respondents from the three agency groups identified evaluation/assessment of mental disorders, substance abuse disorders and co-occurring disorders, and crisis intervention team (CIT) training and support as a top three ranked need.

- Law enforcement:
 - #1 Crisis intervention team (CIT) training and support (27.1%)
 - #2 Evaluation/assessment of mental disorders, substance abuse disorders and co-occurring disorders (22.9%)
 - #3 Suicide risk assessment, response, and protocols (20%)
- Criminal justice agencies:

- #1 Evaluation/assessment of mental disorders, substance abuse disorders and co-occurring disorders (19.1%), Secure/corrections-based behavioral health programs (19.1%), Workforce/hire and retain qualified staff (19.1%)
- #2 Crisis intervention team (CIT) training and support (14.3%), Outpatient/community-based behavior health programs (14.3%)
- #3 Residential inpatient behavioral health treatment programs (9.5%)
- Human services agencies:
 - #1 Evaluation/assessment of mental disorders, substance abuse disorders and co-occurring disorders (25.6%)
 - #2 Crisis intervention team (CIT) training and support (23.1%)
 - #3 Suicide risk assessment, response, and protocols (15.4%)

Q18: Please let us know of any other areas of need that you would encourage our agency to consider.




Figure 23. Source: Massachusetts Research and Policy Analysis Division, JAG Stakeholder Survey, June 2024.

‘Not Applicable’ responses were not included. Responses were categorized into ‘Not Applicable’ when respondents wrote in the response “not applicable” or responded that their agency has no additional areas of need.

Responses were grouped into 13 categories as shown in Figure 21. Overall, equipment and technology was identified most often as an additional area of need for agencies (n = 37), followed by mental health (n = 28), and funding (n = 27).

- Of the 104 law enforcement agency respondents, 33.7% cited equipment and technology as an area of need. 23.1% identified mental health as an area of need, which includes officer wellness programs. An additional 23.1% identified funding as an area of need, which includes availability of funding, restrictions on how funding can be spent (i.e. drones), and restrictions on who can apply for funding (i.e. private and state-funded public universities want to be included).
- Of the 15 human services agency respondents, 26.7% identified victim services and programming, including domestic violence services, as an additional area of need. 26.7% identified a ‘Other’ area of need that did not fit into one of our categories. These responses included expanding legal program capacity, employment for returning citizens, and legal services.
- Of the 9 criminal justice agency respondents, 33.3% identified police policies and practice as an area of need. 22.2% cited funding as an area of need and 22.2% identified a ‘Other’ area of need. These ‘Other’ responses include analyzing outcomes and evidence-based practices and a struggle for legitimacy between civilian and sworn staff.

Q19: Please rank the eight JAG Purpose Areas in order of importance for the communities you serve or the state (rank from 1 = most important to 8 = least important).




Figure 24. Source: Massachusetts Research and Policy Analysis Division, JAG Stakeholder Survey, June 2024.

Respondents were asked to rank the JAG purpose areas in order of importance. Figure 24 reveals similar rankings from respondents across the three agency groups with prevention and education and law enforcement receiving the top two highest summary scores.

- Law enforcement rankings:
 - #1 Law enforcement (7.7)
 - #2 Prevention and education (5.4)
 - #3 Mental health programs (5.0)
- Criminal justice agency rankings:
 - #1 Prosecution, courts, defense, and indigent defense (5.3)
 - #2 Prevention and education (5.1), Mental health programs (5.1)
 - #3 Drug treatment and enforcement (4.9)
- Human services agency rankings:
 - #1 Prevention and education (6.9)
 - #2 Mental health programs (5.2)
 - #3 Law enforcement (4.6), Crime victim and witness (4.6)

JAG Application Funding History

Q21: During calendar years 2019 through 2022, did your agency apply for JAG funding? (select one response)




Figure 25. Source: Massachusetts Research and Policy Analysis Division, JAG Stakeholder Survey, June 2024.

- 59% of respondents' agencies had applied for JAG funding at some point from 2019 through 2022. (Figure 25).
- 37.3% reported their agency applied for JAG funding through OGR.
- 13.7% reported their agency applied through OGR and DOJ.
- 8.4% stated their agency applied for JAG funding directly through the DOJ.
- 16.5% did not apply for JAG funding during the period.
- 19.7% of respondents did not know if their agency had applied for JAG funding.
- 4.4% of respondents reported their agency was not eligible to apply.

Q22: Based on your most recent JAG application, were you awarded funding? (select one response)




Figure 26. Source: Massachusetts Research and Policy Analysis Division, JAG Stakeholder Survey, June 2024.

Of the 148 survey respondents who answered this question (Figure 26):

- Greater than half reported receiving the full amount of their funding request (64.9%), and more than a quarter received partial funding (27%).
- 3.4% of respondents reported their applications were not funded and 4.7% did not know if their request was funded.

Q23: Please indicate the reason you did not apply for JAG funding (select one response).




Figure 27. Source: Massachusetts Research and Policy Analysis Division, JAG Stakeholder Survey, June 2024.

Of the 41 respondents who indicated their agency did not apply for JAG funding between 2019 and 2022 (in question 21), the reasons are provided below:

- 20 respondents (48.8%) did not know why their agency did not apply for JAG funding.
- 10 respondents (24.4%) stated they were unable to apply for JAG funding because they lacked the staff needed to complete the application process.
- 8 respondents (19.5%) reported not having an identified need for JAG funding.
- 3 respondents (7.3%) reported 'Other' reasons.

Q24: During calendar years 2019 through 2022, did your agency benefit from JAG funding received via another agency (i.e., your agency was a recipient of a subaward)? (Select one response.)




Figure 28. Source: Massachusetts Research and Policy Analysis Division, JAG Stakeholder Survey, June 2024.

- 20.5% responded that their agency was a recipient of a JAG sub-award and 33.3% responded they did not know. (Figure 28).
- 46.2% responded their agency was not a JAG sub-award recipient.

Q25: Additional comments about JAG funding that were not addressed in the survey.




Figure 29. Source: Massachusetts Research and Policy Analysis Division, JAG Stakeholder Survey, June 2024.

- As shown in Figure 29, 83.5% of the survey respondents did not have any additional comments about JAG funding not addressed in the survey.
- 41 respondents provided additional comments. Comments were grouped with similar responses into six categories shown above.
 - 51.2% of the comments expressed positive experiences survey respondents had with JAG funding.
 - 19.5% of the comments relate to funding changes desired by respondents, such as increased funding for small agencies and funding that is demographic-based.
 - 17.1% of the comments relate to the JAG funding process, such as applications being too difficult and time consuming.
 - 4.9% of the comments relate to wanting to receive more information about JAG funding.

Appendix A: List of Stakeholders

Leah Harrington – Essex County Sheriff’s Office
Laurie Myers – Sex Offender Registry Board
Peg Crowe – YWCA of Malden
David Sullivan – Northwestern District Attorney’s Office
Ann Marie Robertson – Massachusetts State Police
Courteny Bacon – Judicial/Probation
Elizabeth Englander – Bridgewater State University
Rhiana Kohl – Department of Corrections
Nancy Alterio – Disabled Persons Protection Commission
Arnie Stewart – Committee for Public Counsel Services
Anthony Braga – Northeastern University
Ben Struhl – Northeastern University

Appendix B: Byrne JAG Stakeholder Survey



2024 MA Edward Byrne Justice Assistance Grant Stakeholder Survey Office of Grants and Research

Section I: Introduction

The Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (Byrne JAG) Program is the primary vehicle of federal criminal justice funding to state and local jurisdictions throughout the nation. The Executive Office of Public Safety and Security's Office of Grants and Research (OGR) serves as the State Administering Agency for this award. Per federal legislation, in order for the Commonwealth to continue to receive Byrne JAG funding, OGR must develop a statewide strategic plan that incorporates stakeholder feedback from our criminal justice partners; this will serve as a guide to ensure that these vital dollars are prioritized according to greatest need.

OGR is continuing this strategic planning process by seeking your valuable input with our Massachusetts 2024 Byrne JAG Stakeholder Survey. We are disseminating this survey throughout the Commonwealth to state criminal justice agencies, local law enforcement entities and nonprofits. We welcome feedback from all, including but not limited to judges, prosecutors, law enforcement personnel, corrections personnel, providers of indigent defense services, victim service providers, juvenile justice delinquency prevention experts, and reentry services providers, to name a few.

Please feel free to share this survey link with your criminal justice related colleagues encouraging their participation. Answers to the survey are confidential and anonymous. We do not request any identifying information and no effort will be made to identify any respondent. Our Research and Policy Analysis Division will analyze the information in aggregate; results will be presented to a Strategic Planning Committee soon after.

The deadline to complete the survey is Wednesday, June 19 at 5:00 PM. The survey will take 5-10 minutes to complete. If you have technical difficulties with the survey, please contact Lisa Lundquist at Lisa.Lundquist@mass.gov.

We greatly appreciate your time and participation.



2024 MA Edward Byrne Justice Assistance Grant Stakeholder Survey
Office of Grants and Research

Section II: AGENCY ROLE/GEOGRAPHIC COVERAGE

This section helps us understand the respondent's agency role, sector and geographic service areas.

- * 1. Identify your agency/organization's role in the criminal justice system.
(Specify up to three roles indicating top choice (most relevant) as "First Choice", second choice as "Second Choice", and third choice as "Third Choice").

	First Choice	Second Choice	Third Choice
Administration and Policy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Community-Based Organization	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Community Corrections/Reentry	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Corrections	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Courts	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Community Member	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Crime Lab/Forensics	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Defense	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Education	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Juvenile Justice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Law Enforcement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mental Health	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Parole	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Probation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Prosecution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Public Health	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Social Services (housing, employment, childcare, insurance benefits, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Substance Abuse Treatment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Victim Services/Assistance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Youth Services/programs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Specify "Other" response

* 2. Select the area in which you work **(select one response)**.

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Local Government | <input type="radio"/> Federal Government |
| <input type="radio"/> Tribal Government | <input type="radio"/> Non-Profit Sector |
| <input type="radio"/> State Government | <input type="radio"/> Private Sector |
| <input type="radio"/> Other (please specify) | |

* 3. Identify the Massachusetts counties where your agency provides services.

(If your agency serves the whole state, select STATE as your response).

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> STATE | <input type="checkbox"/> Hampshire |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Barnstable | <input type="checkbox"/> Middlesex |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Berkshire | <input type="checkbox"/> Nantucket |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bristol | <input type="checkbox"/> Norfolk |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Dukes | <input type="checkbox"/> Plymouth |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Essex | <input type="checkbox"/> Suffolk |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Franklin | <input type="checkbox"/> Worcester |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hampden | <input type="checkbox"/> |

* 4. Describe the area(s) served by your agency **(select one response)**.

- ☐ Primarily rural area
- ☐ Primarily urban area
- ☐ Both urban and rural areas
- ☐ Primarily suburban area
- ☐ Other (please specify)



2024 MA Edward Byrne Justice Assistance Grant Stakeholder Survey
Office of Grants and Research

Section III: DATA AND TECHNOLOGY

These questions help us understand your agency's data and technology capacity and needs.

* 5. Accurate data is essential for data-driven decision making. Do you feel your agency has adequate resources for data access/management/analysis and information sharing? **(select one response)**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Do Not Know
- ☐ Other (please specify)

* 6. Does your agency have access to electronic data to help you plan, evaluate your program, and/or determine outcomes? **(select one response)**

- ☐ Yes, we have access to electronic data and it is easy to access information
- ☐ Yes, we have access to electronic data, but it is difficult to access information
- ☐ No, we do not have access to electronic data
- ☐ Do not know
- ☐ Other (please specify)

7. If your agency does not have adequate technology resources or access to the data you need, what is your most pressing technology or information-sharing need?

* 8. Select all the justice system partners that exchange data electronically with your agency (this would not include exchange of data via email).

(If you do not exchange data electronically with another agency, please check 'We do not exchange electronic information with our partners.')

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> We do not exchange electronic information with our partners | <input type="checkbox"/> Courts |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Dispatch | <input type="checkbox"/> Probation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Law Enforcement | <input type="checkbox"/> Parole |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Detention | <input type="checkbox"/> Corrections |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Prosecution | <input type="checkbox"/> Community services (behavioral health, housing, employment, benefit eligibility) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Defense | |

☐ Other (please specify)



2024 MA Edward Byrne Justice Assistance Grant Stakeholder Survey
Office of Grants and Research

Section IV: PRIORITIZING FEDERAL JAG PURPOSE AREAS

This section helps us understand your agency's needs within the federal JAG purpose areas. Please only complete the section(s) that apply to your agency's purpose area(s).

***Purpose Area 1 - Law Enforcement Programs**

*Is this purpose area applicable to your agency?

☐ Yes

☐ No

* 9. Other than general program funding, **select the top 3 areas of need** for Purpose Area 1 - Law Enforcement Programs.

	First Choice	Second Choice	Third Choice
Drug enforcement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Crisis intervention/mental health/suicide prevention	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Gang enforcement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Equipment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Gun enforcement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Training	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Interoperable communication (Enhanced Information Sharing)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Workforce/hire and retain qualified staff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Violence Prevention	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Multijurisdictional Crime Solving Partnerships	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
School/youth-related programs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Access to timely evidence collection and lab services	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Specify "Other" response

* 10. Within the law enforcement purpose area, **select up to three types of equipment** most needed in your community.

- ☐ Electronic control weapons/nonlethal weapons
- ☐ Digital ticketing
- ☐ Surveillance equipment
- ☐ Mobile data terminals and accessories
- ☐ Electronic evidence management systems
- ☐ Radios, accessories, repeaters/repeater antenna
- ☐ Crowd control gear/equipment
- ☐ Fingerprint scanner
- ☐ License reader
- ☐ Handheld narcotics analyzers
- ☐ Other (please specify)

***Purpose Area 2 - Purpose Area 2 - Prosecution, Court, Defense and Indigent Defense**

*Is this purpose area applicable to your agency?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

* 11. Other than general program funding, **select the top 3 areas of need** for Purpose Area 2 - Prosecution, Court, Defense and Indigent Defense.

	First Choice	Second Choice	Third Choice
Indigent defense			
Specialty courts (drug, veteran, mental health, treatment, family, youth)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Court security	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Civil/Involuntary commitment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Life sentence prosecution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Gun/violent crime/gang prosecution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Property & white-collar crime prosecution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Court technologies - (records/case management systems, court security, video arraignment/conferencing)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Training - court/prosecution/defense	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pretrial risk assessment/monitoring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Workforce/staff hiring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Specify "Other" response

***Purpose Area 3 - Prevention and Education**

*Is this purpose area applicable to your agency?

☐ Yes

☐ No

* 12. Other than general program funding, please **select the top 3 areas of need** for Purpose Area 3 - Prevention and Education.

	First Choice	Second Choice	Third Choice
Gang prevention	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Juvenile delinquency prevention	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
School violence prevention	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Substance use prevention (including prescription drugs)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Suicide prevention	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Teen dating/domestic violence prevention	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Youth mentoring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Specify "Other" response

***Purpose Area 4 - Corrections/Community Corrections**

*Is this purpose area applicable to your agency?

☐ Yes

☐ No

* 13. Other than general program funding, please **select the top 3 areas of need** for Purpose Area 4 - Corrections/Community Corrections.

	First Choice	Second Choice	Third Choice
Diversion/alternatives to incarceration	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reentry	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Assessment, evaluation, benefit eligibility/enrollment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Substance use or mental health treatment for incarcerated individuals	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Special population programming (i.e. geriatrics, females, incarcerated parents, youth, and veterans)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Smart probation/parole (i.e. swift & certain sanctions, use of risk assessment tools, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Housing/employment for formerly incarcerated individuals/transitional living	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Workforce/hire and retain qualified staff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Chronic health conditions/outside medical/medications/access to prescribers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Specify "Other" response

***Purpose Area 5 - Drug Treatment and Enforcement**

*Is this purpose area applicable to your agency?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

* 14. Other than general program funding, please **select the top 3 areas of need** for Purpose Area 5 - Drug Treatment and Enforcement.

	First Choice	Second Choice	Third Choice
Community-based/outpatient treatment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Residential/Inpatient treatment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Detox/crisis stabilization	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Community-based detox/crisis intervention center	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Secure/corrections-based treatment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Multijurisdictional drug enforcement partnerships	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mothers/pregnant women with substance use disorder	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Workforce/hire and retain			
Sober housing for formerly incarcerated individuals	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
qualified staff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Outside medical costs/medications/access to prescribers/pharmacy costs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Co-occurring mental illness or other chronic health conditions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Drug recognition experts or trained canines	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Specify "Other" response

* **Purpose Area 6 - Planning, Evaluation, and Technology**

* Is this purpose area applicable to your agency?

☐ Yes

☐ No

* 15. Other than general program funding, please **select the top 3 areas of need** for Purpose Area 6 - Planning, Evaluation, and Technology.

	First Choice	Second Choice	Third Choice
NIBRS compliance - National Incident Based Reporting System	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Criminal records improvement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Forensic science crime labs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Automated information sharing - justice system partners	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Automated information sharing - community services (i.e. Medicaid, mental health, employment, housing)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Developing outcome measures/program evaluation and research	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Strategic planning/determining priorities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Specify "Other" response

*** Purpose Area 7 - Crime Victim and Witness**

* Is this purpose area applicable to your agency?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

* 16. Other than general program funding, please **select the top 3 areas of need** for Purpose Area 7 - Crime Victim and Witness.

(If this area is not applicable to your agency, please check the first response below).

	First Choice	Second Choice	Third Choice
Children exposed to violence, abuse, neglect	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Child advocacy centers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Direct victim services/witness intimidation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Juvenile victims/witnesses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Population-specific services (i.e. LGBTQ, elderly, military/first responders, culturally/linguistically appropriate services)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Community-based/System-based victim witness advocate	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Automated victim notification	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Human trafficking	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Restorative justice initiatives	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Behavioral/mental health services/trauma-informed care	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Workforce hiring/retention	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Specify "Other" response

*** Purpose Area 8 - Mental Health Programs and related law enforcement and corrections programs, including behavioral programs and crisis intervention teams**

* Is this purpose area applicable to your agency?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

* 17. Other than general program funding, please **select the top 3 areas of need** for Purpose Area 8 - Mental Health Programs and related law enforcement and corrections programs, including behavioral programs and crisis intervention teams.

	First Choice	Second Choice	Third Choice
Suicide risk assessment, response and protocols	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Evaluation/assessment of mental disorders, substance abuse disorders and co-occurring disorders	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) training and support	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Residential inpatient behavioral health treatment programs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Outpatient/community-based behavioral health programs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Secure/corrections-based behavioral health programs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Workforce/hire and retain qualified staff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Benefit enrollment and eligibility determination	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Specify "Other" response

18. Please let us know of any other areas of need that you would encourage our agency to consider.

* 19. Please **rank the eight JAG Purpose Areas** in order of importance for the communities you serve or the state.

(rank from 1 = most important to 8 = least important)

- ' Law enforcement
- ' Prosecution, courts, defense and indigent defense
- ' Prevention and education
- ' Corrections and community corrections
- ' Drug treatment and enforcement
- ' Planning, evaluation and technology improvement
- ' Crime victim and witness (other than compensation)
- ' Mental health programs and related law enforcement and corrections programs, including behavioral programs and crisis intervention teams



2024 MA Edward Byrne Justice Assistance Grant Stakeholder Survey
Office of Grants and Research

Section V: JAG APPLICATION/FUNDING HISTORY

These next questions help us understand your recent experience with JAG applications and funding.

* 21. During calendar years 2019 through 2022, did your agency apply for JAG funding?

(select one response)

- ☐ Our agency is not eligible to apply for JAG funding
- ☐ Yes - applied for JAG funding through OGR/EOPSS
- ☐ Yes - applied for JAG funding directly from the Dept. of Justice
- ☐ Yes - applied for JAG funding through OGR/EOPSS and the Dept. of Justice
- ☐ No - we did not apply for JAG funding
- ☐ Do not know

22. Based on your most recent JAG application, were you awarded funding?

(select one response)

- ☐ Yes, we received our full request
- ☐ Yes, we received a partial request
- ☐ Our application was not considered (incomplete, late, nonresponsive)
- ☐ No, our application was not funded
- ☐ Do not know



2019 MA Edward Byrne Justice Assistance Grant Stakeholder
Survey
Office of Grants and Research

Section V: JAG APPLICATION/FUNDING HISTORY (CONTINUED)

23. Please indicate the reason you did not apply for JAG funding.

(select one response)

- ☐ A specific need for JAG funding was not identified
- ☐ Staff was not available to complete the application
- ☐ I do not know why my agency did not apply for JAG funding
- ☐ Other (please specify)

* 24. During calendar years 2019 through 2022, did your agency benefit from JAG funding received via another agency (i.e., your agency was a recipient of a subaward).

(select one response)

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Do not know
- ☐ Specify "Other" response



2024 MA Edward Byrne Justice Assistance Grant Stakeholder
Survey
Office of Grants and Research

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS SURVEY. YOUR TIME
AND COOPERATION ARE GREATLY APPRECIATED.

25. Please write any additional comments about JAG funding that we did
not address in this survey.