



Allison Badger:

Hello everyone.

Good afternoon. Good morning, depending where you are.

Speaker 2:

Good afternoon.

Allison Badger:

It's so great to see everyone. We're going to get started here in about two minutes. Just want to give folks a chance to get in, get settled.

All right. If everyone wouldn't mind just putting yourself on mute just to get started, this is going to be interactive, so don't worry you won't be on mute the whole time. But just as we get started, it might be helpful if everyone mutes up.

And we'll just give it a couple more minutes.

People are rolling in.

I think we'll just give it one more minute, Tenzing, just to give chance for folks who might've been on a previous meeting and we'll kick it off here in a minute.

Okay. I think it's starting to slow down with folks rolling in. So if Tenzing, if you want to kick us off, I think we're good to go.

Tenzing Lahdon:

Sounds good. Allison let me know if my voice is trailing, but good afternoon everyone and good morning to folks on the West Coast as well as Hawaii and Guam. Welcome everyone and welcome to the webinar on Byrne State Crisis Intervention Program, also known as Byrne SCIP. This Byrne SCIP 101 webinar is hosted by the National Criminal Justice Association in close collaboration with my office, the Bureau of Justice Assistance as well as Johns Hopkins University and the National Council on Juvenile and Family Court Judges. And you will hear from each one of these partners today as a part of this webinar. And my name is Tenzing Lahdon and I'm senior policy advisor with Bureau of Justice Assistance.

And joining me today from BJA are Andrew Rodeghero, sorry Andrew, for butchering your last name, feel free to correct me. Angela Balchi, Michelle White, and I think Erich Dietrich is also on this call all from BJA. I understand that some of you may be new to SAA and/or may not be familiar with the Byrne SCIP funding source, which operates differently from Byrne JAG. Therefore we and mostly NCJA has organized this Byrne SCIP 101 webinar to provide a detailed overview of the program. This will also be an opportunity for you to ask questions, have group discussions and learn together. Next slide.

All right, thank you. And before we dig more, we start digging into details of Byrne SCIP program, I wanted to provide a quick overview of BJA and its place in Office of Justice programs because we might have some new folks attending here today. So OJP or Office of Justice Programs is one of the three grant making components of the Department of Justice along with the Office of Violence Against Women and Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. On the right hand side, you can see all the offices that fall under Office of Justice Programs. You can see our office BJA, then BJS, NIJ, OVC, OJJDP and SMART



Office, OJP also provides grant funding, training, research and statistics to criminal justice communities. So, next slide.

Thank you. So the Bureau of Justice was created in 1984 to reduce violent crime, create safer communities, and reform our nation's criminal justice system. BJA strengthens the nation criminal justice system and helps America's state, local and tribal jurisdiction reduce and prevent crime, reduce recidivism, and promote fair and safe criminal justice systems. And Director Moore was appointed by President Biden in February of 2022. Director Moore leads the programmatic and policy efforts on providing a wider range of resources, including training and technical assistance to law enforcement, courts, corrections, treatment, reentry, justice information sharing, and community-based partners to address chronic and emerging criminal justice challenges that exist nationwide. Next slide please.

Thank you. BJA supports this work through following activities, funding which invests in diverse funding streams to accomplish our goals, sharing knowledge including research development and delivery of what works, creation of tools and products to build capacity and improve outcomes. And lastly, ensuring engagement by consulting, connecting, and convening with our partners in the field. Next slide please.

Thank you. And as our agenda today focuses on the Byrne SCIP, I thought a quick background might be helpful before we get into the weeds. The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act was signed by President Biden on June 25th, 2022 to reduce gun violence, save lives, and to make progress towards keeping gun out of dangerous hands. This also sought to ensure that emergency risk protection auditors programs are implemented in accordance with the Constitution and that provides necessary due process protection.

It provided formula funds to implement state crisis intervention court proceedings and related program or initiative including but not limited to, extreme risk protection order program that work to keep guns out of hands of those who pose a threat to themselves or others. Mental health courts, drug courts, veterans treatment courts and my colleague Andrew will provide more additional details on this as a part of his presentation. And before I forget, BJA also funds three training and technical assistance providers under the SCIP TTA award. Johns Hopkins University National Council and Journal and Family Court Judges and NCJA, the host of this webinar. And with that I will pass the mic to Allison. She's Director of Center of Justice Planning within NCJA.

Allison Badger:

Thank you, Tenzing.

Tenzing Lahdon:

Thank you.

Allison Badger:

All right, next slide. So this is our disclaimer just to say our wonderful partners at BJA who support this work, just note that not necessarily everything we say is what BJA has in there their language. So next slide please. All right, so for those of you who have attended an NCJA training before you will know that we really want this to be participant driven. We do have quite a large slide deck with lots of great information because we know that you need that great information. But we also just really want this to be for you all to have some time with each other. So I'm going to go through quickly the agenda. We're



going to do introductions very quickly, not making you all come off mute and introduce yourself. We're going to talk about Byrne SCIP, some key grants administration components. We're going to have time for Q and A and we're also going to be doing several breakout rooms.

We're going to try and put you in rooms with at least eight to 10 of your peers so you can chat and there'll be some TTA providers in those rooms to help answer any questions you might have. So be prepared for the breakout rooms because we're really going to have you all talk to each other and have you kind of report out. We're going to talk about SCIP advisory boards, some potential investments and use some examples of sub-awards that have already been made. And then NCJFCJ is going to do a great presentation on courts and crisis response. And then Hopkins is going to do a great presentation on extreme risk protection orders. And then we will move to the BJA PPI team on the PMT data reporting requirements and we will end it with some more Q and A. So there's lots of opportunity for you all to ask questions and interact.

And please use the chat. We have someone monitoring the chat, so please feel free to chime that in anytime. You can use your reactions to raise your hand at any point. So don't be afraid to do that. We really want participation. You also have the ability for closed captioning and so you are able to add that closed captioning and on the bottom with the more button. And so we have generated that for the transcript. But if you need that for your own screen, please feel free to put the closed captioning on. Just a couple of things that we have learned that have been a little tricky, if you have called in, you will need to merge your call in with your registration name in order to participate in the breakout rooms. So if any of you have called in and just have a phone number showing, which I don't see any, so that's good, but if for some reason you have to call in, just make sure that you merge your audio with your Zoom phone, I'm sorry, your Zoom screen so that you can hear and talk in the breakout rooms.

So if you're having any issues with that, just put that in the chat and we can go into more detail. I'm also going to put in an email in the chat. If you get kicked out and you're having issues, please email Amanda and she will get you hooked up right away. A few other housekeeping, this is being recorded. The breakout rooms will not be recorded. And so those are a place for you all to just talk peer to peer, be as open and honest as you want. We always call them kind of like Vegas rooms. What happens in there, stays in there. We all know you have your own challenges you need to talk through and that's what these connections are all about. And we have a participant packet for you as well. So we're going to go ahead and put that in the chat.

It has some key resources that will be helpful in your planning processes and we will also send that out after. I think that covers the logistics. Next slide. No suffer rule. Obviously, we're all adults. If you have to hop out for a call, no big deal. Ask a lot of questions because I can guarantee you, you are not the only one who has that question and participation is always highly encouraged. All right, as I said, we're going to do really quick introductions. Each partner is going to introduce themselves when they speak just to not have the whole front be intros. And so I'm Allison Badger with NCJA. As Tenzing mentioned, we have a few other folks from NCJA on the call. We have our partners at Hopkins, NCJFCJ, and BJA on the call. For the state introductions, we would love it if you all would change your name and you do that by clicking the three dots.

Hover over your own face, click the three dots in the top right corner and click change name. And if you could add your state, that would be really great. It just is a helpful way for the states to be able to know who has similar kind of state profiles. So if you all wouldn't mind adding your state to your name, that would be wonderful. And lastly, we would love if you would enter in the chat sort of where you are



within your planning processes in Byrne SCIP, what kind of state you are. Are you forming your crisis board? Have you just recently had your program plan approved? Are you moving towards solicitations?

We'd love it if you wouldn't mind entering in the chat, just sort of where you are in your state so we can get a sense of where everyone is. And don't be shy because we know for a fact that there is a large spectrum of where everyone is in their planning processes. So everyone's kind of all along the map, so there's no shame if you're just getting started. And so please feel free to share that in the chat. All right, I am going to pass the mic to Andrew.

Andrew Rodeghero:

Well, welcome everybody. I guess I'll give a couple of seconds or I'll get started to let everybody kind of fill in that chat as I go. So again, welcome to BJA's programs portion of this SCIP 101 webinar. While I am presenting, if you would please enter any questions in the chat and we'll do our best to answer them either as we go or I think we have a question section at the end. So if we don't get to your question, please feel free to follow up with me after the webinar and we will schedule a time to speak. So during today's webinar, we're going to cover an overview of the SCIP program and provide some additional details as states have begun submitting their state plans and sub-award requests.

So again, welcome everyone. My name is Andrew Rodeghero. I am a state policy advisor with BJA's programs team and working with your SCIP awards. I know I've spoken to many of you already, but for those that I haven't, I am glad that you joined today. So as far as our agenda, I know most of you are familiar with the SCIP program at this point. Our agenda today includes a very limited overview of SCIP. We're going to give some examples of the allowable uses and a QA session to allow some time for questions specific to your program. For a more general overview of SCIP, we put some links to prior BJA webinars at the end of the presentation.

Okay, so let's discuss the SCIP program under which all of your states are funded. So as Tenzing noted on June 25th, 2022, president Biden signed The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act of 2022 into law to reduce gun violence, save lives, and to make progress toward keeping guns out of dangerous hands. The SCIP program seeks to fund states for the purpose of implementing programs related to the crisis intervention court proceedings and related programs, the appropriation, \$750 million, which comes out to 150 million over five years. So far, BJA has made 51 awards worth nearly \$250 million. Next slide, please. Some of the key programmatic requirements of the SCIP program are shown here. First and foremost, you should be establishing your advisory boards if you have not already. Please make sure you have met the membership requirements of this board. I would recommend noting in your plan which member meets what role, if it's not already clearly outlined. This has been a common reason for state plans being returned for clarification. Then once established, your advisory board-

Andrew Rodeghero:

Then once established, your Advisory Board should help generate your program and budget plans, and inform those project goals, plans for pass-through, and subawards. Please note that BJA must approve all subawards prior to any subaward activity. Next slide, please.

We'd also like to see acknowledgement of the coordination requirement with BJA and its TTA providers, and any planned use of funds for evaluation efforts. Until the plans are approved via GAM Adjust grants, no more than \$20,000 may be obligated, expended, or drawn down. And then finally, I want to make



sure that everyone's aware that SCIP uses the Performance Measurement Tool, or the PMT, which I know we're going to go into a little bit later in the presentation, for its performance reports. These are completed quarterly in the PMT system, and then uploaded semi-annually in JustGrants.

Even if your program and budget plans have not been approved, please make sure your Grants Awards Administrator is completing these reports and then noting any delays. I do review all these reports, so if there's any assistance needed and/or barriers, please include those, and I will reach out to you after seeing your report.

Okay. Program budget plans. As I just mentioned, your plans must be approved in JustGrants with a scope change GAN. The withholding condition associated with your plan allows obligations not to exceed \$20,000 for the sole purpose of developing the plans in coordination with your Advisory Board.

When you submit your plan, make sure to update your project description, and if it's applicable, the project title. We want to ensure consistency with the Board-approved plan, and when updating the project descriptions, try to avoid using any special characters, avoid copy and pasting from Word into JustGrants, to avoid any unnecessary hard returns or tabs. If your plan is to include Extreme Risk Protection Orders or ERPOs, the ERPO certification is also required, but I know Johns Hopkins will provide some more information on that later, including the requirements for the use of funds for ERPO activities. Next slide please.

So, SCIP pass-through requirements. As you begin identifying your subawards, I do want to emphasize the specific allocation requirements for SCIP. They are different than Byrne JAG, they're entirely separate. In addition to the state funding portion, you need to allocate a minimum of 40% to your local units of government. This portion of the pass-through is not eligible for a waiver, and it is required for all the awards, with the exception of some territories. Of the less than 10,000 funds, you may provide it to the state courts directly to the less than 10,000 jurisdictions, and/or you can request a waiver to fund a state-level project that directly benefits those less than 10,000 jurisdictions. Also, keep in mind the 10% that can be used for administrative activities, is 10% of the total award. So it doesn't impact the required pass-through amounts. That means that it must come from the state share of funding. We've also included an allocation document online that gives you the exact numbers for this by category, so no math is required.

As you begin proposing subawards, I would ask that you carefully review the request and ensure that they are applicable to scope of the SCIP program. Prior to making any subawards, you must receive approval from BJA for each subaward proposal. We are looking for a few key items to be included in your GAM. First of those, you need to have a letter on agency letterhead, signed by your authorized representative. Next, we should be able to see the selection process and a list of subawards that you're seeking the approval for. We also require a narrative description and a budget detail for each subaward. And then I would ask that you please include the subaward performance period and the allocation category that you're planning on funding out of. So, whether it be state, local, or the less than 10,000 allocation. Next slide, please.

Elisa Nicoletti:

Hey, Andrew.

Allison Badger:



Andrew.

Elisa Nicoletti:

Excuse... Oh, pardon me, Allison. I was just going to say that Andrew, I believe we have a question. Are you okay to take a question right now from Morgan, Morgan Williams?

Andrew Rodeghero:

Absolutely.

Elisa Nicoletti:

Thanks.

Andrew Rodeghero:

Yeah.

Morgan Williams:

Thank you everyone. I just have a quick question. Andrew, you and I have talked multiple times on the phone, I'm Morgan Williams from Utah. The less than 10,000, and this is just a clarification, is that coming from the same list that were sent out via the JAG less than 10,000 ineligible grants, or is that a separate list that we need to be contacting our state courts about?

Andrew Rodeghero:

Yes, it is the same list, and we can provide that eligibility list if you'd like. That would probably be helpful for other states.

Morgan Williams:

Awesome, thank you. And then one more question. Will you be sending out this slideshow, I missed if that had been said already?

Andrew Rodeghero:

Yes. Yep.

Allison Badger:

Awesome. Thank you so much.

Elisa Nicoletti:

And I see we have another question, actually, from Ian.

Ian Silva:



Hi. Sorry, Andrew. We've talked on the phone as well, Ian Soler from California. When you say budget detail in the subaward requirement, are you requiring the entire budget or a summation of what's in the budget?

Andrew Rodeghero:

So, we are requiring enough detail that we can see what is included. So when I say budget detail, yes, I would say within reason, we would need to see, at a minimum, at the category level, but I would say probably more specific at line item level.

Ian Silva:

All right, thanks.

Andrew Rodeghero:

All right, I think that's it for the moment.

So, now we're going to talk about some of the unallowable and then also allowable costs on a Byrne SCIP, Unallowable costs. In addition to the unallowable costs identified in the DOJ Financial Guide, per the SCIP solicitation, award funds can't be used for these items you see here. We have come across a few requests containing one or more of these, especially in reviewing the sub-award requests, so I would just ask that you ensure you screen your proposed subawards for any unallowable costs and then go back to those before providing to BJA. Next slide please.

Then in addition, so in general, as a matter of federal law, funds may not be used either directly or indirectly to support the enactment, appeal, modification, or adoption of any law, regulation, or policy at any level of government. Should any questions arise as to whether a particular use of funds would or may fall within the scope of these prohibitions, the recipient is to contact BJA for guidance and may not proceed without the express prior written approval of BJA. It's important to note that this restriction applies not only to your agency, but to your sub-recipients, as well. One resource that is available is the DOJ Financial Guide, and specifically you can refer to Chapter 2.1 for restrictions on lobbying. Next slide please.

What is allowable? Going beyond the specific costs pivoted in solicitation in the Financial Guide, BJA has received some questions about what in the SCIP program, what it can be used for, and what we're looking for when we review plans or requests for subawards. I think the key is that all submissions, including subawards, must contribute directly to crisis intervention. And I know that's a broad category, but I do want to say as a note, we are working on making updates to the SCIP FAQ document and to provide additional clarification, but for now we're going to give you a couple of examples of approved subawards and how they demonstrate crisis intervention.

We have approved subawards from a number of states, and I want to share some of the general programs that we have seen across multiple state requests, and hopefully that'll give you a little bit of direction in your planning.

Number one, we have seen some state storage campaigns, which seek to provide means of firearm storage and education for firearm owners. This could include purchasing gun locks and storage for individuals and businesses, but it also could include public awareness campaigns and/or trainings.



Number two, Crisis Intervention teams and co-responder model expansions. These help pair obviously law enforcement and local treatment providers and/or mental health professionals to better address those actively in crisis.

Number three, specialty courts. We have seen several core programs, including domestic violence, substance use, mental health programs.

Number four, the School Resource Officer programs. We have approved various SRO programs, including additional trainings for SROs in crisis, de-escalation, and intervention.

And then finally, Number five, this is a little more broad. The technology and software improvement. SCIP funding can be used for certain technology, including improvements to identifying risk of violence that allow law enforcement to respond to crisis prior to. Technology upgrades that allow the more efficient transmission of records that would result in a decrease in errors and an increase in timeliness of responses. Again, programs should prioritize crisis intervention rather than response. It's not necessarily the items being budgeted in these requests, but rather the context in which they're being proposed.

Next slide please.

So as I mentioned at the beginning of the presentation, BJA has provided a number of resources, including the two previously recorded SCIP webinars. These webinars go a little more in depth on the nuts and bolts of Byrne SCIP program basics. While the links on the right-hand side we provide you our most up-to-date documents, such as the FAQ, the JustGrants resources, and the allocation documents.

Next slide please.

There are also a number of ways you can stay connected with us and updated with OJP throughout your grant, and this slide covers a couple of ways. You can subscribe to OJP newsletters and updates. You can also stay connected with BJA through our different social media channels, and then also through the BJA website. Next slide please.

With that, do we have any additional questions in the Chat? I know we have time for questions throughout the presentation, so don't feel pressured if you haven't thought of something right now.

Allison Badger:

All right. So, now we're going to make you talk. We are going to put you all in breakout rooms with your peers. There will be a few TTA providers in the room, and BJA is going to stay in the main room, so they will not be in the breakout rooms. We're going to do 10 minutes for the breakout rooms, so plenty of time for you all to just talk amongst yourself. We are going to do this three times. So for this one, we really wanted to give you all space to talk through the planning processes, specifically. We are going to have one that is specific to stakeholders and the Crisis Board requirement and all of the things that go into that. So, if you want to save anything related to the Crisis Board or stakeholders for the next breakout room, that would be great.

This one, we're thinking you can talk about how you're handling the drafting of the program plan, what you're doing for your 40% pass-through, your under 10,000s, any challenges or successes you have had in your planning processes so far. And just communicate with each other and I do think, Simone, correct me if I'm wrong, that after 10 minutes it will automatically put you back into the main room.

Simone Greene:



Yes, correct.

Allison Badger:

Perfect. So, we're going to push you out into some breakout rooms. And again, correct me if I'm wrong, Simone, but this breakout room will be the same as the next one. So let's start maybe with some introductions, name and state, just so you can get to know each other because you'll be meeting with the same group twice. And afterwards I'd like us all, so if anything really interesting comes up in your group, we're going to open it up for folks to report back to the larger group. If something interesting came up. No pressure for everyone, but if so, select someone in your group to be the spokesperson when we open it back up.

And then the other thing that we thought might happen once you all started talking is that you might have some questions that comes out of it. And so, please feel free to write down any questions that you also want to ask. BJA is going to be on the training the whole time, so they can chime in and ask questions. In your participant packet, there's a little place to take notes if you want to use that.

But before we kick you into these rooms, any questions?

And did anyone join just by phone?

It doesn't look like it, so we should be good. All right, we are going to move you into your rooms.

Allison Badger:

Hi, everyone. That did not feel long enough for our group. Did that feel long enough for your groups?

Demaxia Wray:

Allison, we were just getting started on our end.

Allison Badger:

We're going to up it. We're going to up it to 15 minutes for the next one, how's that sound?

Demaxia Wray:

That's good.

Allison Badger:

All right. Let's see, is everyone back?

I think so.

Does anyone have anything they want to sort of report out that they found interesting or that was kind of uplifted to the top?

Eryn Branch:

Well, I'll just say that the group that I was in, there seemed to be some consensus around how helpful it would be to have clarity about allowable and unallowable activities. I know that this webinar will help a lot with that, but any guidance that we could provide to the group about how to really drill down when



they're having conversations with their Advisory Committee or they're thinking about developing their solicitations, it would be, I think, helpful to the group that we were speaking with.

Allison Badger:

That's great feedback. And I know we're going to talk a lot more, not necessarily in the category of allowable versus unallowable, but in sort of the spirit of the award, and then also what subawards have already been approved, to give you an idea of what's passing through. And then Andrew mentioned this earlier, but there will be new FAQs coming out, which should help clear up some of that. And there's some great new resources that we should have coming out soon as well to help give some ideas.

And then, always know that you can reach out to BJA ahead of time to check and say, "Hey, my Council had this really good idea. I want to know if this is even allowable before I write a solicitation."

Eryn Branch:

Nice.

Allison Badger:

BJA is very happy to do that and give feedback, they've done that with several states so far. And it's a really good safe way to make sure that what you put out in your NOFOs is going to work. So know that's coming, and then we will do some more deep dives into subawards here in a little bit.

Any other groups have anything that was brought to the top that they want to share?

All right. In our group, we did talk a little bit around the ERPO certification. And so that, I know, Spencer and Lisa plan to talk a little bit about that, and just know that Hopkins can help your state navigate some of that. So, just know that's available to you all in your states, and we will up the time for the next breakout room so we can actually get into that discussion.

All right, I will pass the mic to Jess, my colleague.

Jessica Grisler:

Awesome, thanks Allison. Hi everybody, and welcome back. For those of you that I haven't worked with before, I am a program manager with NCJA Center for Justice Planning. So a little bit about who the National Criminal Justice Association is. We are a nonprofit organization based in the DC area. We represent state, local, and tribal governments and practitioners throughout the criminal justice field with the purpose really within this field to strengthen the criminal justice communities as well as improve this by empowering stakeholders. So we have four main pillars that guide our work. The first we are a convener and a facilitator, an advocate and a liaison, a thought leader, and lastly, a training and technical assistance provider, which we will talk in more detail about today.

Next slide. Awesome. So NCJA has five amazing centers that make up our organization. The first is our membership center. We have the Data Center, the OVC Center for VOCA Administrators, the Center for Grants Management, and lastly, the Center for Justice Planning, which is where our Byrne JAG and Byrne SCIP TTA will fall under. Next slide please.

Awesome. So a little bit more information on NCJA Center for Justice Planning. So through BJA, NCJA Center for Justice Planning is the long-standing training and technical assistance provider for both Byrne



JAG and Byrne SCIP, so a lot of you have received TTA from us, but for those that haven't in our role, we provide guidance primarily to SAAs and local CJCCs on strategic planning, stakeholder engagement, the use of data and promising practices. And we do this through direct assistance webinars, workshops, trainings, toolkits, resources, and my favorite peer-to-peer learning opportunities.

Next slide. Awesome. So let's dive further into Byrne SCIP and talk a little bit about some of the requirements for those that are receiving funding. Awesome. So Andrew already mentioned this, but just to really reiterate it, so some of the program management requirements for Byrne SCIP include the development of a crisis intervention advisory board to help inform your state's SCIP program plan.

So some additional requirements again include BJA and your advisory board's approval of your program plan, your budget, as well as subawards. And lastly, more in depth data collection and evaluation will also be required.

Next slide. Awesome. So what really are the differences of Byrne JAG and Byrne SCIP? Well, there are a few. So a few key differences are that Byrne JAG has state and local direct awards where Byrne SCIP only has state direct awards. Byrne JAG's funding comes up front and in a lump sum where Byrne SCIP has a reimbursement model following the approval of your program plan and your budget. Byrne JAG has a strategic plan and annual report requirement where Byrne SCIP has a program plan that their advisory board must approve as well as it has the levels of approval from BJA that we've talked about a couple times. Byrne JAG has a variable passthrough where Byrne SCIP has the 40% passthrough. And lastly, Byrne JAGs less than 10,000 can go to state police and Byrne SCIP's less than 10,000 can go to state courts.

Next slide please. Okay. So it's been mentioned a few times that Byrne SCIP requires a crisis intervention advisory board, so this board must include a diverse pool of members to help guide the state's gun violence initiative. The board must have representatives from law enforcement, community courts, prosecution, behavioral health providers, victim services, and legal counsel and like mentioned before BJA must approve your program and budget plans before funds are obligated and the board will also be required to approve any further changes.

Next slide please. Awesome. So while isn't a formal definition of community for Byrne SCIP, it's really, really important that they are engaged in the process right away.

A few examples of community representation can be community-based organizations and nonprofits, faith and community leaders, citizens and individuals with lived experience. So they can fill that community requirement within the advisory board.

Okay, so we've talked about required stakeholders on your advisory board, and we want to really emphasize that those are, I'll say, the bare minimum of folks that need to be engaged, but we really encourage you to think about additional stakeholders to involve. So I won't list all of them, but just some additional stakeholders to consider are state court administrators, 988 partners, your local NAMI representative, CJCCs, your SAC, or your statistical analysis centers, and any partners involved in the governor's or mayor's challenge as well. All of these are a really good option to kind of include early on in the process.

So we went through and we looked at some of the current SCIP advisory boards and what additional members they were including in real time. So we have seen a lot of states use their existing JAG board or councils. Several have included research partners and folks from the academic sector, tribal community reps, rural representatives, the Department of Health, Department of Education, and as you can see,



several others. So you can see right away that states aren't just engaging the required stakeholders. A lot of them are going that extra mile and engaging some additional folks as well. Awesome, pass it over to you, Allison, for some more peer to peer.

Allison Badger:

All right. Any questions before we move into a breakout room initially? Just remember that if you have it, I'm sure at least five other folks have it. So any questions at this point?

Okay. So for this next breakout, we are going to be moving into the same rooms. You might have some additional folks or some folks who have dropped off, and I apologize for anyone who might be getting kicked off intermittently. That is strange and hopefully we can find it, figure it out, but for this one, we really want to talk about stakeholder engagement, the crisis advisory boards, how you all have gone about them, if you had to start one from scratch. In the last group that we were in, there were some discussion around just having a hard time engaging stakeholders that normally your offices don't engage. So, please use this time to talk to each other about that and if anyone has come up with any really great ideas on how to engage new partners, maybe for instance, behavioral health or the community, talk amongst yourselves about that. Then we can also share some ideas that we've heard as well.

So we will do 15 minutes this time because we're actually doing really good on our timing right now, I think. So let's go ahead and break out for 15 minutes. We'll come back and we can report back, ask any questions of the group and go from there.

Simone Greene:

I'll just make a quick note before we open up the rooms that unfortunately if you get kicked out of a room, you are not, I cannot put you back in the same room. So I apologize if you get kicked out of a room and you get put in a new room and you were really having a great time with that original group. So that's just one note before I open up all of the rooms.

Allison Badger:

All right, I think we're rolling back in. Give everyone just a minute. We are going to do a quick report out and then we're going to give you all a little break, but I would love to hear from you all. Any interesting tidbits that came out, any challenges you want to uplift to the group and ask for feedback on, or anything that you've had success with? Please come off mute and share. Why do I not hear anything?

Spencer Cantrell:

So I know in my group, Alison, some folks said that there'd been some challenges getting folks together. Everyone's so busy, but that they'd been really valuable to the advisory boards and had had a lot of great insight about what different needs were around the state. That some advisory boards had put together just smaller subgroups to help talk through things and then present it to the rest of the board, and different ways to talk about the plan or looking at grant applications. That way it was a little bit more efficient and folks could really drill down and have fewer scheduling struggles, potentially.

Allison Badger:



That is a really good idea because once you get high level folks, trying to get a calendar invite alone is like a full-time job. So that's really good thought.

Anyone else want to share challenges or successes?

Eryn Branch:

I'm happy to share. Oh, Allison, one question came up in our group where we didn't have a very robust response or conversation. So it might be something we just want to come back to as more pure learning and encouragement, is when there's not consensus in the group about where the money and priorities should be and how to facilitate that because that is the kind of thing that really can stop progress. So I think we didn't have great ideas, but I thought it was a really probably a common concern. So, I would love to talk about that at another time.

Allison Badger:

Yeah, no, that is a really great, great point and very common. I used to be the director of a criminal justice coordinating council, and so that happens a lot. So, has anyone experienced that and come out the other side with a success story?

Mark?

Mark Thatcher:

Yeah, if I can get myself off mute here. So, I think part of the key to making that work and to get a consensus among the stakeholders is to actually go through a complete strategic planning process and put together a strategic plan where you have, we put together a strategic plan where we had goals and objectives and timelines for each one of the pots of money. The 60%, the local direct, and the less than 10,000. Then stick to that strategic plan as you move forward. If at some point the advisory board wants to revise a strategic plan, then you can go through the process of doing that, but I think it's really key to have a strategic plan to guide the process. Otherwise, you can't get a consensus very effectively from all of the members. Especially if you have, we have 18 members on our advisory board and it would've been really hard to get a consensus without a strategic plan in place to guide how you move forward. So, just my thoughts.

Allison Badger:

That is a really, really great point. You know that we love strategic plans and they are extremely helpful tool even if you can't do a full-blown five-year strategic plan, even just having a strategic framework can be really helpful.

In our strategic planning training that we do for JAG, we talk a lot about guiding principles and sometimes that can be helpful if you as a group can come to consensus around guiding principles. So data-driven approach or inclusive of diverse ideas and stakeholders. You can all agree on these principles. Sometimes you can go back to those to say, okay, is this program that we disagree on, does this meet our guiding principles? If so, great, let's move it forward and if not, maybe we find another bucket of funding for it or we talk about that a little bit more. So I love that idea, Mark. That's really good feedback.



I don't want to plug NCJA too much, but I'm going to because I just am. We are doing a board development training in May. So be on the lookout, it is going to help you all think about how to set up a board, how to manage it, how to get consensus when things don't agree. It's a day and a half, it's going to be in Minnesota, so just be on the lookout for that because I think it could be really helpful if you have a particularly tricky board that you're working with, especially if it's new. There's lots of stages that new councils and boards go through. You very rarely show up on day one to a new board and it feels like everything worked well, I've learned that the hard way. So just be on the lookout for that board training. Does anyone else have any thoughts in response to that gathering consensus?

Doyle Allbright:

I couldn't figure out how to raise my hand, but I'll maybe add what was said last. The strategy we took, because we were convening a board for the first time and we had a lot of information that you're throwing at them. Some of it is, to be honest, relatively vague about what could be done.

So what we did, I think along the lines of strategic planning, was to do a lot of research ahead of time, show them what we found, and then come with just a couple of suggestions on focus areas based on the research so we had backing. That way, we're not just opening it up to any idea, which of course creates a lot of debate and it introduces the opportunity for people to get off on tangents that might not even be possible or allowable. So instead of opening up to the board for suggestions, we gave them a few, a couple of suggestions ourselves to say, this is what we're thinking that we're going to focus on.

Allison Badger:

That is really, really great feedback. The other thing to just add on that is a lot of what happens, a lot of what can be helpful, I guess I would say with a board is the hallway conversations and preparing your board members with all the information they need. Getting some buy-in ahead of time from a few folks, maybe having a champion in the room, that can also help move consensus a little bit. So thinking about running by an idea or two by a couple of board members ahead of time so that when it's presented, you already know that a few folks are comfortable with it and things like that can be really helpful.

The other thing I wanted to just flag to your comment, we at NCJA have done a couple of presentations maybe for about five or six states on just what Byrne SCIP is and the ideas around what some states are doing with the funding to give ideas to the states. We have found that to be really helpful, particularly for newer boards who are like, what is all this language? I don't understand what all these grant words mean. Just tell me what I'm doing and what are the limits. So just know that there's always the option for any of the TA providers, or BJA, or NCJA to attend your board meetings and give them the background and give them... We tend to give examples of states with similar profiles so that it makes sense for your state. So if we're going to present in Kansas, we're going to talk about similar states that are geographically similar, population size similar, politically similar, so that it's relevant for you and it can give you ideas of what your peers are doing, which can be really helpful. So just know that's always available as well.

Anyone else want to share anything from the stakeholder groups?

All right. I had one other example I wanted to share, and I can't tell if Minnesota is on, but Minnesota did something really, really interesting with their SCIP board as they set up a application process. So the... I'm sorry. Yes, Quentin, the board development training is going to be in St. Paul on May 29th and



30th, and I think the announcement is going out this week, if not already, so be on the lookout for that. But Minnesota put out an application for their board members. So anyone could apply. They reviewed the application and chose who made the most sense, but they ended up with a whole board of brand new folks, most of the folks that they'd never worked with before. It was really, really cool and really interesting to see how they all interact and what they view as the priorities. Everyone left their own personal job hats at the door when they came in to meet. So it was just a really unique way to get SCIP advisory board members. So I thought I would highlight that.

Okay. One last chance for questions before we take a quick break. Any questions? Oh, thank you, Amanda. All right, let's take a break until 2:30. Does that sound good? Feel free to stay logged in and just go off camera and mute yourselves and then we'll come back at 2:30 Eastern. I'm really bad at converting other time zones, so hopefully you all know what that means.

Allison Badger:

All right. We'll give everyone just one more minute, and then we will jump right in.

Okay. I hope everyone is back. We are going to get into some fun stuff. We're going to talk a lot about what other states are using the funding on. And we are just having a smidge bit of technical difficulties, so we'll extend the break for another minute. Hold tight. It wouldn't be a virtual training without technical difficulties.

Lisa Geller:

I was going to say, Allison, we're not up yet. We're-

Allison Badger:

No. No. Not yet. You got a minute to stretch if you need to stretch it out. I know this is a long virtual training, but it's worth it.

Let's see. There we are. Thank you, Iyana. Oh, actually, I want to give a quick plug. If you all have received an email from Iyana Crawford on the NCJA team, we are going to be developing a website, and on the website we will have a Byrne SCIP directory for the SAA. So just check your emails for an email from Ayana. We're trying to get the best single point of contact for Byrne SCIP for that website. So just be on the lookout for that, as it will be coming to you all if it hasn't already, and there might be a reminder coming your way.

Okay. It wouldn't be an NCJA training if we weren't talking about strategic planning, so I just put in a really quick slide here. And it's almost as though Mark knew what our future slide would be, because the strategic planning, large-scale or small-scale, is really important. And these are the four main pillars that we focus on when you're trying to identify priorities, and it can be really helpful if you are able to have these four main pillars. So stakeholder input, which you would get through your advisory council. But this can be done beyond your advisory council with surveys, focus groups, town halls. We've done several surveys for SCIP for several states, so know that we have that ability here. And focus groups are a great way to get that qualitative information. So, just having that stakeholder input in helping you determine your gaps and your needs is really important.



Data. Obviously, it's really important to be able to show what the data says that the needs and issues are. Everytown for Gun Safety has a great website around firearm violence by state, and gives you high-level breakouts whether it is suicide, homicide. So, please look in all these various locations. We will have a document coming out soon that should have some information on that, but data is really helpful, and it can also really be a helpful tool in that consensus-building. So if you're trying to decide between a few programs, but you have data to support one versus the other, that might be a helpful way to get you to that consensus.

Historical context is obviously really important. Are there programs that you've supported in the past that were really successful that you might want to continue to support, or that you might want to build a model off of? And understanding your scope. Although Byrne SCIP and Byrne JAG is a lot of money, it is not endless amounts of money. So, just making sure that you are able to keep your scope in-check. And that is particularly important with Byrne SCIP, since that scope really needs to be related to this crisis component. So, just wanted to throw this slide in there. Thought it would be helpful as you think about how your board and your office starts to identify priorities. Next slide?

So we have heard loud and clear that there is still a little bit of lingering around what this funding can be used for, and there is an intentional reason for not giving a list of, this is allowed and this isn't. And that is because BJA really wants to allow some flexibility and creativity among the states. If they think something is going to be really great and a great fit, we don't want to send some message out there that this is not allowable. So that is an intentional practice that allows a lot more creativity and flexibility for great programs, but we have tried to narrow this down into different categories about the programs that can be supported.

So, I'm just going to go through this. I'm not going to read every word, because you will get a copy of this. But support for states implementing ERPO programs, training for the ERPO programs, communication, education, public awareness campaigns. Those are for states who have Extreme Risk Protection Order laws in place. Support for problem-solving courts or specialty courts such as treatment, mental health, veteran courts. And this as important. You can expand that programming to specifically accept clients with firearm violations. If you also manage the other BJA funding for specialty courts, that is not allowed under that funding. But under SCIP, you are able to accept clients with firearm violations. So that's a really important distinction, and this could be done in many ways. It could be just a separate track. I won't get in too much of the weeds, because it's definitely not my specialty, but just consider that component.

Support for court-based programs that identify and provide support for people in crisis. Darren, Nancy, and Eryn are going to dive into this a little bit more detailed in a little bit. Support for deflection or diversion to behavioral health treatment and support services for those at-risk to themselves or others. We've heard from most states that they plan to support these kinds of behavioral health initiatives with their SCIP money, so that's wonderful. And then last but certainly not least, funding for law enforcement agencies to safely secure, store, and track firearm ... I'm sorry. Safely secure, store, track, and return firearms. I want to be very clear, though, that this is not an exhaustive list. This is sort of a high-level group of ideas, and we're going to dive in a little bit more here. So, next slide?

I do want to put this big, fat disclaimer on here that says this is not an exhaustive list. And as I mentioned before, grantees are really encouraged to reach out directly to BJA. Andrew would be a great point of contact, and he can help you navigate if the ideas that you are thinking would be approved as a sub-award. So, we will continue to update information. We should have a document coming soon that



has a list of various ideas for programming. So more information about this will continue to come out, but I just want to encourage you all to check with BJA as you're going through this before you get to the solicitation/writing phase for something that doesn't feel like an obvious yes. Next slide?

ERPO support. So I'm going to cover this at a high level, because Lisa and Spencer are going to cover this at more details later on. But training for the implementation of ERPO programs, communication, education, and public awareness. This can look very different depending on your state. Could be fact sheets, brochures, webinars, training for family members, first responders, law enforcement, judiciary court. So Hopkins will talk about this a little bit more in detail, but this is a high-level view of what you can support in the ERPO space. Next slide?

Support for deflection and diversion to behavioral health treatment. So, this could really include quite a bit. Assertive community treatment. Behavioral threat assessment program. Triage services, such as mobile crisis units. Co-responder models we've seen quite a bit. Technological support for smartphone applications to help families and patients navigate mental health crisis situations. And specialized training for individuals who serve or are family members of individuals in crisis. We've seen quite a bit in this space, between the program plans that have been submitted and the sub-awards. So, there's a lot of really great things that can be supported in this space. The new 988 initiative that, I guess, isn't totally new anymore, but is fairly recent. So talking to behavioral health partners about what programs that could be put in place to support the 988 initiative could also be a great thought for this space. Next slide?

Specialized court-based programs. So NCJFCJ are going to cover this more in-depth, but threat assessment training for prosecutors, judges, law enforcement, and public defenders. Technology. Development and implementation of validated gun violence risk assessment tools. And then, of course, expanding that capacity of existing drug, mental court, veteran treatment courts. And another court that's not on here, domestic violence court, as well as maybe some community court models that are out there. Next slide?

Funding for law enforcement agencies. So, gun locks and safe storage. We've heard from a lot of states that there is a pretty big issue with being able to store relinquished firearms. Software and technology to track relinquished firearms. Development and delivery of specialized training, such as deescalation, crisis intervention training, and things of that nature that have that direct nexus to crisis response. I will note that there are a few things in the law enforcement category that have been denied by states, and that is active shooter training and NIBIN. So active shooter, it is sort of too far past the intervention point at that point. So again, these are just examples of reasons why to check in with BJA ahead of time to make sure that something that you all have planned might not fit in the category of that immediate threat crisis nexus. And we're going to talk a little bit more about law enforcement as well.

Okay. Some additional high-level ideas that we've seen. Research planning and evaluation. We've seen a lot of states who are partnering with their SACs or research partners to evaluate the landscape of their state with gun violence to help direct the funds better in the future, which is a great use of funding also to help support program evaluations that might be coming down the road. Domestic violence protection order support and enhancement. Most states have an infrastructure around DV protection orders and the removal of firearms, and this funding can be used to support some of those initiatives that might be underfunded. CVI initiatives, community violence intervention programs with a focus on reducing gun violence, immediate gun violence. And then I mentioned support for 988 and other suicide-prevention efforts are great categories for this funding.



So, I'm going to pause here to see if anyone has any questions about what we've covered so far before we dive into the sub-awards as of the end of February. Any initial questions or comments?

All right. Then I will move into sub-awards. So NCJA has been tracking sub-awards, and thank you to all the states who responded. We got permission from all the states to share the sub-awards that have been approved. So we have categorized them to the best of our ability, and we're going to go through some of these sub-award ideas that have been approved by BJA in the states. The general themes are addressing behavioral health in schools, community-based programming, interventions in the courts, firearm safety in the community, policing, jails, and public defender and prosecutor's offices. Next slide?

Okay. Addressing behavioral health in schools. And just know that Elisa on our team, she's the one who's been analyzing this. If there's anything that you want to find out more details about, just throw it in the chat or raise your hand. And she might be able to give you more details right on the spot or, at the very least, in an email later. Okay. Providing advanced training and de-escalation, digital threat assessment, and trauma response to school resource officers. Additional clinical social workers and mental-health-wellness workers across schools and early childhood centers. Expanding existing crisis mobile diversion program that supports multiple middle and high schools. And implementing immediate firearm detection programming in schools. Firearm safety in the community. We've seen statewide campaigns promoting safe firearm storage practices, offering free safe storage devices, and evaluation of safe-storage campaign effectiveness.

And I see we have a question. "Do school districts count as a unit of local government for the purposes of the local pass-through?" I am going to ask Andrew if he wouldn't mind answering that, just so I don't get it wrong. Andrew, are you here? He might have had to-

Andrew Rodeghero:

I am. I apologize. I was double-muted.

Allison Badger:

Did you see that part-

Andrew Rodeghero:

[inaudible 02:01:44].

Allison Badger:

... in the chat, about school districts?

Andrew Rodeghero:

Yep. Do school districts count as units of local government? I will double-check on that. I do not believe so.

Allison Badger:

Okay. We will double-check and get you an answer. Great question, though.



Okay. Let's see. Community-based programming. So expanding afterschool programming to include older youth by including robust STEM and workforce development and programming. Establishing stronger mental health and wellness social learning programs for at-risk youth. Creating a Rapid Care Coordination and Treatment team that quickly connects high-risk individuals with mental health and/or substance use issues to services, eliminating the long wait times and other barriers that currently exist. Excuse me. Implementing a project Welcome And Resource Notification (WARN), which is a program designed to deter people from committing firearm-related crimes through education about consequences of gun crimes. And the creation of behavioral health liaison position to act across agencies and community behavioral health providers to facilitate collaboration, communication, and more timely responses. All great examples. Next slide?

Courts. So, expanding treatment court capacity. Including individuals with violent offenses. We talked about that. Providing emergency transitional housing support when necessary. Significantly increasing staff to include more clinicians, case managers, dedicated treatment coordinators, and more. Planning to assess needs and build infrastructure to serve these folks. Implementing evidence-based screening tools designed to assess risk of committing firearm or violent crime. And training for treatment court staff regarding specialty court best practices.

All right. Oh, Andrew put in the chat, "For the purposes of Byrne SCIP, a unit of local government is a city, county, township, town, or certain federally-recognized American Indian tribes." I'm not entirely sure that gives us an exact answer, so we might need to do a little digging. Andrew, do you think that gives us an exact answer?

Andrew Rodeghero:

No, it doesn't.

Allison Badger:

Okay. Good.

Andrew Rodeghero:

That's pulled from our FAQs.

Allison Badger:

Okay.

Andrew Rodeghero:

So, yeah. We'll get a better definition for you. I think it may depend on how it's worded, and how it's funneled through to those school districts, and possibly the jurisdictions that it's in. So, I will see what I can do.

Allison Badger:

Okay. Perfect. Yeah, and it could depend on how your school system is set up as well. But we will double-check on that, because that would be really good to know. Okay. All right. Moving on. Oh, we got



some more information. "Direct local pass-through. This could include, but not limited to, an organizational unit such as a prosecutor." Oh, okay. So, it might be. It's looking like it might be, but I will let Andrew do some more research on that, just to make sure we cover that fully. Really great question. Thank you.

All right. Policing. Virtual reality training simulator ... Words are hard today. For police officers to train in a controlled environment for an array of difficult scenarios, including de-escalation and cooperative/uncooperative subjects. We've seen this in a few places. Crisis Intervention Teams is a great use of this funding. Establishing officers as a part of a CIT team. Providing training to better support police officers, first responders, and dispatch personnel as they respond to crisis. Co-responder and related programming, expanding existing initiatives. We've also seen either co-responders or mobile crisis units quite a bit, and we will have a new resource out soon that will be able to give a breakdown of what each of those means. Sometimes we use them interchangeably, and they are different models. So, be on the lookout for more information on that. Co-responders to identify individuals at-risk for gun violence, training officers for how to respond to crises involving firearms, and embedding co-responders within police departments. Next slide?

Within the jails ... And just a reminder, these are only the sub-awards that we have seen as of February 29th. So just a reminder that this is not, obviously, an exhaustive list of what you can support jails for. But expanding existing jail navigator programs. So adding staff such as case managers or providing CIT training for jail staff. I will say that is something that is often under-looked, is getting the jail staff trained in CIT, but really important. Public defenders in prosecuting. Implementation of holistic public defense representation, including risk needs assessments, connecting clients to services that mitigate their risk of violence and increasing access to effective interventions. Nobody knows these clients better than their public defenders, and so great example there. And increased domestic violence training for victim advocate and local law enforcement. Next slide?

All right. Finally, I'm done talking. So, we are going to -- this is something I've never explained before, so bear with me. But we are going to do breakout rooms, and you are going to choose which one you want to join. So we are going to have a courts option, an ERPO option, a law option, and a behavioral health option. Now, I fully recognize that you all might be supporting all of those, but select the room that you are either struggling with the most or that you want to talk to your peers about the most.

Now, if you go ... It shows up differently depending on the version of Zoom, because of course. But if you cannot see the breakout rooms in your bottom corner ... It should pop up, "Join a breakout room." But if that doesn't work, you click those three dots, and then you click breakout rooms, and then you should be able to self-select your choice. Is that working? Yes. We got a thumbs-up. Okay. So, self-select into the room you'd like to go into. We are going to be there for 12 minutes, and this is going to be a great way to see who stepped away from their computer. Just kidding. All right. Go right ahead.

Allison Badger:

I've been muted this whole time and I have been talking. That is funny. Okay. Thank you Kate for telling me I was muted and I'm going to try this again. Okay. Luckily, I think I'm done talking soon. I wanted to open it up before we open it up to everyone, just to see if anyone here on the call has supported the virtual reality training for law enforcement, either with their JAG or is planning to do so with their Byrne SCIP. And if so, would you mind just talking a little bit more about it? And if not, we'll provide more



information after the fact, but does anyone know anything about the virtual reality training that we mentioned?

Kathryn Ganley:

Yeah, I can't speak to it in depth here in Maryland, but in Maryland we had the Police Accountability Act of 2021 passed and that required all police departments in the state to purchase body worn cameras for every single officer. But then it also had funding for de-escalation training and things of that nature. I do know that we have funded numerous departments in that virtual reality type of training for both de-escalation, bias and other trainings along. But I can't speak to how well they're doing. I just know that we have funded them in the past.

Allison Badger:

Thank you, Kate. That's great.

Victoria Hauan:

Oh, there we go. Nevada has funded virtual reality or de-escalation virtual equipment for our state police academy, our post academy and these are through JAG funds and we've given two direct JAG awards to local police departments or local police department and then one in Las Vegas. So that's four different virtual equipments that we've given out for the state.

Allison Badger:

And Victoria, do you have any sort of insight on whether or not the police departments are liking them, if you think they're effective?

Victoria Hauan:

Yeah, all the feedback that I've heard and the progress reports that we've gotten from the agencies is it's been a really big asset and a big important tool for them to go in and I mean, virtually be in a lot of these incidences and it includes dealing with autism, people with mental health, people that are suicidal because I sat in on two of the sessions where they've shown us how it works and somebody's trained to change the situation based upon the officer's, his reaction to the situation. They could make the individual have a gun or have a knife, they can change the situation. I think it's a fantastic tool. And then Elko, which is in the Northeastern part of the state, the mines bought them a 360 degree, huge virtual equipment, and everybody just swears by how great this stuff is.

Allison Badger:

That's great feedback. Thank you. And if you are interested in learning more, and Victoria we will get you connected with a couple of states as well. I know Iowa is using SCIP to fund it, but I think Dennis had to drop off, so we'll get you connected with them as well. Who wants to share from their groups?

Lisa Geller:

I can share from the ERPO group, Allison. We had a great conversation about what folks are planning on using funds for as it relates to extreme risk protection orders. And one idea that was also floated in our



group was whether there could be some sort of subgroup or subcommittee or sub meeting out of this larger group that focuses on states that plan to use the funding in that way. And I think that could be applicable for all the areas, so for courts and any other type of crisis intervention or that you're planning on using funding for to break off with the states that are going to be using funding in a similar way and talk about where they plan to put the funding. And then in a few years, even looking back and saying what worked well for the first couple of years? Do we need to shift our focus? So I think that could be a good way to keep track of what's going on in other states and make sure that we're also using the funding effectively.

Allison Badger:

That is a really good idea. Quick show of hands, how many of you all would find it helpful to have sort of little advisory groups based on these areas? You can use your little hand thingy, reaction thingy. Okay, perfect. We're getting some hands. That's great. So we can definitely, us TA providers, we will work on that with BJA. Okay. Now I'm going to say remove your hand so I don't call on you, but does anyone else want to share from their report out, maybe from the courts group or the behavioral health group?

Darren Mitchell:

I can start to share from courts. This is Darren from NCJFCJ, but if any of the members of the group wants to speak, please don't let me stop you from doing that. We had a conversation around some of the administrative challenges around passing money through to state courts and specifically AOCs and what that looks like. And there was some good sharing of approaches. It sounds like several of the folks who joined that group are either are or are anticipating getting money out. They have unified court systems, so they have a central AOC that governs the work of the courts. And so they were planning on passing money out to the AOC to be used in ways that are effective for the courts. And a little bit of conversation around some of the challenges, if a state administrative office, the administrative office of courts is not totally bought into some of the ideas around the SCIP activities that are court focused and how to overcome that impediment.

And one interesting approach that was mentioned is around treatment courts. And if overall your state is not into treatment courts, but there are some maybe specialized or treatment dockets within courts, that may be a starting point and it's possible to have the people who are doing it and think it works to kind of elevate that on a statewide level and try to promote that work a little bit more. But it sounds like folks are engaging with their court folks. Most had administrative offices of court or other court representation on their advisory boards and no one reported it being a struggle to get there. So I think folks are still trying to figure it all out, but lots of energy and good ideas.

Allison Badger:

Awesome. That's really great. And if you are having any issues engaging with your courts, please reach out to NCJFCJ, they can certainly help you with that. Okay. Anyone from the behavioral health group want to report out?

Eryn Branch:



I can do that, but I would urge people to set me straight if I misrepresent anything or leave anything out. I think I heard two significant themes. And the first was that for law enforcement and for courts, it's kind of a new thing to reach out to victim services and behavioral health providers in a community or state and get coordinated. So sometimes not even knowing what offices to call or what people to call is a challenge. And so I would lift that up as just sort of a way that we can provide good TA to those of you who want to start there.

And then the second thing is we had some really, really good conversation about the number of communities who do community violence interruption and the models that might be adopted and the things that can be learned from those communities is really compelling to a number of the people that were in the behavioral health group. And so we shared some communities and we shared some training opportunities and it was all very helpful. But I would say that this merging of behavioral health is not as fluid and intuitive to some of us as it will be at the end of this project.

Allison Badger:

Beautifully said. And I will say NCJA is bringing on some behavioral health subject matter expertise and I think NCJFCJ, so many acronyms as well. So if you are having a hard time finding someone in your state to serve on your board or to help get the word out to behavioral health communities, just reach out. Your state NAMIs are also a great place to look and we have a great connection with National NAMI who can help us get you some contacts. So don't spin your wheels and struggle because that's why we're all here. We can help you make these connections. Is anyone, and I don't want to call out Mark, but I might call out Mark if he is willing to just talk about a little bit of a report out from the law enforcement group?

Mark Thatcher:

Yeah, I guess I can talk a little bit about it. We briefly brought up the idea of, or at least I did anyway, the idea of not funding active shooter programs for SROs and law enforcement and how Montana at least took an exception to that quite a bit and felt that that was a good use of funds. But also we brought up the idea or I brought up the idea of a program that we'd funded called ZeroEyes, that is actually artificial intelligence software that's installed in school based camera systems that detects any firearms that are brandished within the schools and within seconds lets officials, whether it's law enforcement or school officials, know right away about it. And I don't know, we talked about, I guess we talked a little bit about whether there's law enforcement, school districts could be funded through what pots of funds or if they're considered units of local government or whatever. I don't remember if we talked about that within that law enforcement section or not, but I don't know. I guess that's about all we talked about. We've touched on a few other things, but.

Allison Badger:

Thank you, Mark. I really appreciate it. And just to confirm, Erich with BJA put in the chat that school districts is an eligible SCIP recipient. So if it's a unit of local government, it is ineligible. So if you're unsure again, just reach out to BJA, they'll get back to you quickly and you don't need to spin your wheels. Thank you so much, Mark. And I put in the ZeroEyes into the chat, so hopefully you all can see that as just an example of some of these AI tools. I will say AI can get a little scary. We have a podcast on AI at NCJA and just some of the ways there might be some inequities. So just do your research with the



AI tools. And I am going to ask one more time if anyone wants to share before I officially pass the mic. Any other things pop up in your group discussions that you want to bring to the larger group? Oh, Mark.

Mark Thatcher:

Yeah, another thing I forgot, we talked briefly, I think we got cut off at the end, Allison, about school resource officers working with their school mental health professionals to address high risk youth and youth in crisis problems and stuff like that. Mental health related and that sort of thing. And how we had funded some programs in that direction and that seemed to be going pretty well, so.

Allison Badger:

Awesome. Very good point. And I'm going to put the ZeroEyes back in the group chat because it might've only gone to those in the law enforcement group. So just in case that's true, I just put it there just to give you an idea. And I will, oh, Elisa.

Elisa Nicoletti:

Nope, just saying it's confirmed. It's there now. I see it.

Allison Badger:

Perfect. All right. Now I know we're probably all losing a little steam, so let's do a quick stretch, stretch, stretch, stretch, stretch because we've got some great stuff coming and I'm going to pass the mic to Darren, I think, right?

Darren Mitchell:

Actually Eryn's going to get us started.

Allison Badger:

Eryn. Okay. Eryn, you're up.

Eryn Branch:

Thank you. Hi everybody. First things I'm going to do is put into the chat right now a link to a webinar that we did just last week where we were talking about the court-based TA. So if anybody just can't get enough, you can go watch that and get some more detailed explanations. And I should say as I start and as I end, that we just welcome the most complex and the most simple and the most formal and the most informal outreach. Just please feel like you can reach out to our team. So I'm Eryn Branch, I'm a director with the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, and I have the pleasure of working on this team. And I'm so excited to be making, I think what's going to be an ongoing long-term relationship that I think will really have an impact in our community.

So probably I should say we've heard already a lot of conversation around courts, which I find really, really exciting and a couple of mentions of good judicial officers who are sitting on advisory committees, which makes me so happy that you have their help. But I just want to say that at any point in your planning, if any of your ideas or questions or stakeholders intersect with the courts and the judiciary, we



hope that you would reach out to us. We are the formal TA provider in that category for all grantees. So next slide. I can't seem to move it. Thank you.

So this is just a fun little infographic about who the NCJFCJ is. And I realize that many of you may not know our work because we really are primarily a judicial organization. And so this speaks to our impact, but I also want to say that the council takes a lot of pride in the fact that we have been working for 87 years with judicial officers and that the judicial officers who are members of our organization are a self-selecting group of judges who want their courts to work better and who want to be leaders in their community.

And so what we can really bring to you is judges who can take a leadership position, but also judges who can inspire your judges and courts to push towards innovation and to push out of their standard role of calling balls and strikes. And it's a truism, and I hate to say it again, because we say it all the time except for it just is so helpful, that when judges call a meeting, people come. And judges tend to be really helpful facilitators and partners in getting big things done in your community. And so I would urge you to think hard about how the courts can be involved in your work. And as you think about that, to think how the council can help you. We can help you engage, we can help you facilitate, and we can help you really roll up your sleeves and do some difficult policy work.

I've heard a number of people in the breakouts I was in talk about, "Well, there are models of this thing we're interested in, but our law is weird or our courts are structured in a different way. And so I don't think we could do that." And I just want to say I hope and think you can and we can help you, so. Go to the next slide. So it's really my pleasure actually to introduce you to my team. And all of these folks are people who bring tremendous expertise to the work that we're doing. They're going to each have a chance to speak. And so they'll introduce themselves at the beginning of their portions of the slides. But I can't tell you how really proud I am that we can offer you such support that's done in a specific way that really meets the needs of your communities.

We'll be listening for your priorities, and we have a track record of working with courts and communities across this country to do innovative and challenging things. And we've assembled a team that can only speak to those needs. So they'll each introduce themselves to you. I guess I would only say by way of more introduction from me, I've been with the council for 12 years. I'm deeply, deeply committed to motivating and supporting courts in reducing gun violence in our country. And I've had the pleasure of working on some amazing projects where people came expressing only a need without a plan, and we were able to help them really do some good things in their community. And I hope that's true of our work with you. So with that, I'm going to hand it over to my colleagues and you'll get to meet them, and I'm here for questions. So thank you.

Nancy Hart:

I'm Nancy Hart. I am a senior program attorney at the National Council. And like Eryn, I've been at the council for about a little over 12 years, but I've spent the last 30 plus years working in the court arena of trying to improve the court systems response to individuals, especially domestic violence victims, but more generally just trying to improve the way that the court system and the larger system responds to people who have trauma in their lives. So it's a pleasure to be here. And I'm going to go ahead with, I think you've heard us say it several times this morning already, and Allison mentioned it as well, but we



view courts as critical partners in this SCIP work. Many people involved in court cases are at risk of harm to themselves or causing harm to others...

Nancy Hart:

... Who are at risk of harm to themselves or causing harm to others, including as a result of firearms violence. And of course, the SCIP funding is focused on crisis intervention, and these people are obviously in crisis.

And this is true of the full spectrum of court proceedings; in criminal court, family court, juvenile court, civil court, treatment courts, and specialized dockets.

So again, as we've said several times, we consider that courts are critical partners and we hope that you will view courts as critical partners in your SCIP work in particular.

We know that many of you are already working with courts, either having representatives on your advisory board or supporting court-based projects, and we're really eager to hear more about what you're doing, and as Eryn just said, eager to offer our assistance in helping to augment the efforts that you already have underway.

Next slide, please.

So courts are in a unique position to identify people who are in crisis or at risk of causing harm to themselves or others. And they are in a unique position to make referrals and connections to services for these folks, including victims, and to take effective action to ensure the safety of court personnel and others within the courthouse as well. So there's sort of two different categories where courts can really make a significant difference in the safety and services available to not only their staff, but the individuals in the courthouse.

Next slide, please.

And in general, courts are great partners for SCIP because judges can promote innovation in community responses. You heard Darren mention this earlier, or maybe that was in a breakout, and I think Eryn also mentioned it, but judges in particular, but courts in general are in a position to promote innovation in the community, and judges in particular are in a great position to provide leadership on galvanizing support and engagement from local practitioners and the community.

So I am going to hand over to Darren at this point.

Darren Mitchell:

Thanks, Nancy.

Hi everyone. My name is Darren Mitchell. I'm a fellow with the National Council and work closely with Eryn and Nancy and Allison on this project. I've been with the council as an employee for a little over a year, I've been a consultant with the council for about almost 20 years, and I've been working in how courts and communities respond to violence; mostly intimate partner violence, but other areas as well. It's now my 25th year doing that work.

So I am really thrilled to be with you today. These conversations in small group and also in a large group, the level of engagement and excitement around doing this work in your states and territories, it's impressive. And it's exciting for us who've been talking about it without having as much opportunity to



talk with you about it as we'd like. So we're hoping that this will be the start of many, many more conversations to help you in your work, especially around courts.

So I've been assigned to talk about some concrete examples of opportunities that are presented within court systems to achieve the overall SCIP objective.

So we're talking about, as Nancy mentioned briefly, identifying court involved people, which can be litigants, it can be court stakeholders, lawyers and probation officers and others, it can be others in the courthouse as well, who are in crisis and maybe at risk of harm or of causing harm. And once they're identified, to take steps to figure out what's going on, to kind of screen them and assess them to better understand what the situation is and what the risks posed are. And then finally, of course, to connect those individuals with programs or processes or services, whether they're in-house, in courts, through court programs, or they're outside of the court in community or other service providers.

So that's really what we see essential to the court work under SCIP. We'll talk about some of those details.

And I'm going to start by talking about some tools and training that we can provide generally for you and for others to make sure that courts take advantage of these many opportunities.

So one is we are developing a tool for courts to do sort of a self-assessment of their ability, their capacity to identify and then respond in the way I just mentioned to folks who are in crisis. So that will be rolled out. We'll be hopefully putting courts in a position to take a look at what they're offEryng, who their personnel is, and what steps they can take to enhance a response to people who they come into contact with, court folks, who are in crisis.

We also are in a position to help around systems mapping, including the Sequential Intercept Model, or SIM, which I'm sure many of you are familiar with; a kind of framework or conceptual model that communities have used and are continuing to use to take a look at the full spectrum, from downstream of any sort of court involvement or system involvement, all the way through a law enforcement response or a different type of response, through a court process on the criminal side, through post-conviction or diversion or whatever's happening in the case, to re-entry in the community; to take a look at all those different opportunities or under the model intercepts to figure out what we're doing to assist people who are in crisis, that hopefully in many instances will not criminalize them, will not subject them to a criminal prosecution, incarceration or other forms of punishment, but instead will get them the help they need and help keep themselves and others safe through that process.

So this is a model that can be used by courts and by others in some instances with judicial leadership. And we've seen that judges in courts taking a leadership role in their communities around SIM has been an effective way to develop some interventions that can be very helpful.

So we can provide help, and SCIP activities can engage in. And some of the examples of approved state plans include SIM and court focused work, and then training of course.

And this point is specifically about firearms relinquishment and then monitoring to make sure that if people are ordered to relinquish their guns that they're actually following through.

We've seen this in a number of state plans and we're starting to see it in approved subawards: how can SCIP funding support the ability of orders from courts to relinquish firearms that those are actually meaningful tools and not just an honor system, where people who want to comply with the orders will and those who don't never face any kind of consequences?



So we can work with you and you can use funding to address this in a variety of court settings, from domestic violence to juvenile court settings, to even treatment court settings, some of this can happen.

Next slide, please.

And yeah, you can just keep clicking. We have this animated.

The next piece is around training on behavioral health issues for court personnel, for others involved in the process. And the idea here, of course, is that judges and court staff at all levels can be trained to understand, recognize and respond appropriately when behavioral health issues arise in cases, what the appropriate interventions are, and some alternative diversion and other approaches that can be taken for folks who are in crisis in this way.

So we can train, and we have partners who can come in and co-train folks throughout your court system on these issues.

In addition to that, we can offer training around threat assessments. And this is critical for safety of not only the individuals, the litigants and others in a particular court case, but threats that are posed to the courthouse itself, to judges, to court personnel, to anyone who may happen to be there, and of course the broader community as well. So we can help with some threat assessment work.

And a lot of what I'm talking about, you'll see natural connections and overlap with some of the other behavioral health issues, some of the ERPO response, and some of the areas that SCIP funding can be used for. And so one of the things we'd like you to walk away with is to recognize that there may be a court role or a judicial role in all those different areas, and we'd like to help you understand that and maybe make it happen in your states and territories.

And then there's the idea of having some sort of linkage between courts and all the people that they come into contact with, the court-involved folks, and people outside the court system who can provide help. So creating liaisons, contacts, warm handoffs to folks, for folks to behavioral health specialists outside the court. And we'll talk about some specific examples that have been cropping up that we know are sort of emerging best practices in courts and that are starting to show up in some state plans and in some approved subawards.

So we can go to the next slide.

Here we're looking at a few other things that courts can do to address these issues. And one is to think about what kinds of evidence-based effective screening tools can be used to identify at-risk individuals or people in crisis in various court settings.

And this can be for purposes of deciding whether they are eligible for and appropriate for treatment or other specialized court programs; it can be so that the court, so the judicial officer, can issue orders that are going to be responsive to the risk. There's a variety of tools and a variety of contexts in which these tools can be utilized in the court system and we can provide you assistance on that as well.

And in fact, I've seen a couple of subawards even that are looking at screening for, it was mentioned a couple of times in the treatment court context, folks who have used firearms or there's other violent behavior in their past who are going into treatment court programs. We'll want to understand if they're appropriate, and also if they do go into the programs, what kind of risks are posed and how can we manage or mitigate those risks? And so we can help with that as well.



Trauma responsiveness is really a way for a court system overall to kind of cultivate a culture where individuals aren't retraumatized. People who are in crisis or have been affected by trauma are not retraumatized, but instead are assisted and supported by court personnel, by judicial officers, by whoever comes into contact with them.

And so this requires strategies for all the court players to have training and to understand processes and strategies to implement to make sure that they are not further traumatizing or retraumatizing folks, and in fact, are offering this kind of assistance we want no matter their role.

But also, it means looking at your forms and your processes and the interactions that individuals who are court involved have with the system to make sure that they're trauma responsive. And we can help with audits and assessments and other ways of figuring out whether courts are truly trauma responsive, which is really kind of a baseline level to make sure that people who are in crisis are going to at least not ... The situation's not going to be made worse.

I mentioned earlier this idea of liaisons to community-based folks, and one of the ways that we're seeing this work well, and we're starting to see some SCIP money being devoted to this, is embedding behavioral health specialists, providers within court systems; behavioral health navigators or peers who can offer peer support in linkages and warm handoffs when folks in courts are in crisis. And one of the things that we've seen and learned is that this need is a very dire need within our courts.

And so people who are in the court system with behavioral health specialization backgrounds, mental health practitioners and others, who are there to do other things, like provide evaluations in custody cases or play other roles, help with competency determinations, they're being pulled into this work. Folks are saying, "Hey, I have this person, they need help. I don't even know where to start." And so to formalize that and put people who, this is their role to be behavioral health liaisons, specialists who can make those connections, is something that we think will be very powerful within court systems and is right in line with SCIP fundable activities.

Next slide, please.

In addition to that and complementary to that is to make sure that service providers, advocates for cases involving violence are in the court, that they're based at the court. Because we have learned in years of doing this work that providing that kind of immediate access to assistance is critical. People will take advantage of that when they have someone to talk to who's friendly, who's trauma informed and who's helpful within the court system. This requires space, it requires time and resources, and would be a great use for SCIP court funds to try to introduce these kinds of programs and support these kinds of programs.

Diversion is always an issue in cases with folks who have behavioral health challenges, especially within the criminal court system, to avoid criminalizing or further criminalizing folks who are experiencing behavioral health challenges. And there are opportunities for courts using SCIP funding for that aspect of things.

As well, of course, as has been mentioned several times, is treatment courts and specialized courts and enhancing those; mental health courts, veterans courts, gun courts, we're seeing.

We're seeing domestic violence, and we've seen a couple of SCIP plans that want to look at domestic violence specialized courts as well. And the idea that people with prior violence on their record, firearms



access can enter these treatment courts and they can benefit from the treatment court process and not cause further harm and not pose further risk.

So what does that look like, through trained case managers, court orders that are then monitored for compliance and enforced if necessary? All those kinds of approaches are things that we can help with within that treatment court context.

The final slide is going to look at some issues around or some opportunities around domestic violence focused courts. And we've seen now in state plans and in subawards that have been approved that domestic violence, some states, territories are looking at domestic violence as an area that they want to devote some SCIP funding to because of shortages from other [inaudible 03:00:36] funding sources and for other reasons.

And we of course can help with that. We have decades of experience working with courts around the response to domestic violence, and that can include doing dangerousness or lethality assessment effectively before court and within court, and how it can be considered by judges in decision making and all those kinds of things; we can help you with the development of specialized domestic violence court programs, drawing on years of lessons learned from court programs around the country that are doing this, whether they're specialized courts or specialized dockets; and finally, around firearms and domestic violence and what effective domestic violence court or other court responses are in cases where someone who's causing harm to their intimate partner or other family members, what can be done about ordering them not to have firearms and then following up on that and making sure that they remain in that state of not having guns.

So a quick overview of these various opportunities for courts. I'm going to turn it back over to Eryn, who's going to talk about how we can assist you in taking advantage of all these opportunities.

Eryn Branch:

And actually, knowing that you all have the slides and that we are a little pressed for time, I'm going to ask if we could advance to the slide that says 'summary of training and technical assistance.'

There we go. I just want to give you all a sense of what the council, the NCJFCJ, will be doing.

Simultaneously with providing training and technical assistance to you in whatever way is helpful and whatever way really furthers your engagement of courts and your good use of courts and their leadership and the opportunities that Darren has described, I just wanted to tell you that we'll simultaneously be developing some tools that are designed for courts to be doing some self-assessment of their capacity to meet the needs of individuals in crisis and to do the kind of risk assessment that we're talking about and that the council prides itself.

And the work and training we provide always includes connecting courts and professionals to other folks that are doing similar work so that you can learn from them: judges learning from judges, court administrators learning from court administrators, law enforcement who has a good partnership with their judges talking to other communities who want to do that work. And that we love to do that hand in hand with you.

So with that, I'm going to encourage you to ask questions in the chat and to reach out to us however you can. And then I think we're going to turn it back to our host so we can learn a little bit more about other TA providers.



Thank you, guys.

Allison Badger:

All right. I think we are going to pass it on to Lisa.

Give yourselves a good stretch. We had planned a break, but we are running out of time, so I apologize. So just stretch it out, get your energy back, and Lisa, I will pass it to you.

Lisa Geller:

Thank you, Allison. And we won't take too much time, because I know we have a lot more to get through before we finish at 4:30 Eastern.

But my name is Lisa Geller. I'm the Senior Advisor for Implementation at Johns Hopkins at the Center for Gun Violence Solutions. And along with my colleague, Spencer, who you'll hear from in a minute, we co-lead the National Extreme Risk Protection Order Resource Center funded through this cooperative agreement with BJA.

So we're going to talk to you today a little bit about extremist protection orders, what they are, what type of TA we can provide, some other things that are important for you all to know as you consider writing your plans for this first year or for subsequent years if you decide to go back and add this into the mix if you have an ERPO law in your state.

So just to quickly put everyone on the same page, extremist protection orders are civil protection orders that are modeled off of domestic violence protection orders. As we know, those exist in all 50 states, DC, and extremist protection orders are different in that they're only law in 21 states and DC. And we'll show that slide in a second. But they are similar in that they're civil protection orders, the processes are similar. Oftentimes the judges here in these cases are similar as well, the same judges.

But they're different in a few key ways. Extremist protection orders solely address access to firearms. So they are a tool, if you have it in your state, to be used to temporarily restrict access to firearms for someone at risk of harm either to self and/or to others, and they also prevent the purchase of new firearms while the order is in effect.

So just focusing on firearms, the eligible petitioners for extremist protection orders are also different than the DVPO. There are more people who can petition, including those listed up here on the slide. We talked a little bit in our group about the types of petitioners and whether there should be more training for some, such as healthcare providers, which eight states or seven states and DC have healthcare providers as petitioners.

And then lastly, they're similar to DVPOs in that there is this temporary order that lasts typically up to two weeks and a final order that typically lasts up to a year.

So on our next slide, you'll see the list of states and DC that have extremist protection orders. So if you live and if you represent one of the states listed here and you're not sure if you want to use this funding for extremist protection order implementation, please reach out. You'll obviously have our contact info. If you don't already, it'll be on the slide, and I'm sure Alison will provide it in all the subsequent materials. So please, please reach out.

So 21 states and DC are eligible to use the funding in this way.



And then lastly, before I turn it over to Spencer, I just want to talk a little bit more about when an ERPO might be appropriate, because I think some people are not sure when this should be used as a tool to address gun violence.

And really what we look at first and foremost is threats or acts of violence towards self and/or others. A lot of the cases I've reviewed, there's threats towards self and others, so I should really add the and/or here. But really that's the main criteria I think that courts are considering. That's written into the state statutes for when an extremist protection order might be appropriate.

The respondent or potential respondent doesn't even need to currently possess firearms for this to be appropriate because it would be a prohibitor on purchasing new firearms as well. But all these other factors listed here can and should be considered by courts when deciding whether or not to issue an extremist protection order.

But I will say that it's possible that one of these factors alone is certainly not sufficient, particularly looking at that last category here, recent acquisition of firearms. It is not simply enough for someone to have recently acquired firearms for an ERPO to be an appropriate tool. But when we put that factor alongside some of the other risk factors listed above, threats of violence, violations of protection orders, history of alcohol or substance misuse, then we start to see an increased risk profile. But I don't want this to be taken out of context. It's certainly not the case that any one factor here listed alone would be sufficient. We really have to consider the whole picture.

So I'll turn it over to Spencer to talk a little bit about some of these due process protections and certifications that you all would have to do if you were going to use the funding in this way.

Spencer Cantrell:

Good morning, good evening, good afternoon, wherever you are in the world. I am Spencer Cantrell, also a Senior Advisor for Implementation at the Johns Hopkins Center for Gun Violence Solutions, and with Lisa, we co-lead the National ERPO Resource Center.

So a few folks have during today's webinar mentioned the due process certification. So if you're going to be using your Byrne SCIP funding for ERPO, someone in your state has to certify that your state's ERPO laws and programs are consistent with due process. From the states that have certified so far, we've seen a few different folks signing that certification. We've seen one Attorney General, someone else that was a deputy within the Attorney General's office. We've also seen counsel for an SAA signing that certification as well.

So I think you're going to need to decide within your state. That's something that I think I'm happy to talk with you or with Alison, we could coordinate, and figure out who would be the right entity within your state to certify the due process protections. I'm happy to chat that through.

But really when we're thinking about due process and ERPO, we're wanting to make sure that certain rights are protected in your state's statutes and programs. And I will just note that when Congress was discussing the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act that included this Byrne SCIP funding in it in summer of 2022, senators Cornyn and Blumenthal both went on the record talking about the constitutionality of ERPO laws and programs that existed at that time. And just thinking about suspenders and safety [inaudible 03:09:52] approach, they included in the statute that these are the due process protections that need to be included in all ERPO programs.



And these things may not be articulated explicitly in your ERPO statute, right? Some of these things might be embedded in court procedures or in rules of civil procedure or evidence, right? But they are things that are included in your state's ERPO law.

So notice; making sure that the respondent at the appropriate phase has the right to notice. That might not be at the ex parte stage. And that's something that we see consistent with due process in a lot of other contexts, right? That sometimes there is an emergency hearing, an emergency decision given the high stakes in a case.

There's also the right to an in-person hearing at the appropriate phase, the right to an unbiased adjudicator. That means whatever judicial officer in your state is presiding over ERPO matters. It's not just the sheriff saying, "We're taking away Joe Smith's guns", right? That has to go through an unbiased adjudicator.

The respondent has the right to no opposing evidence like they would in any other case, the right to present evidence, the right to confront adverse witnesses, the right to counsel at no expense to the government. I believe it's only Colorado that funds respondents counsel in ERPO states.

And then penalties for abuse of the program, which might be included explicitly in your ERPO statute and program, or it might be included in your state's perjury statute. It would be against the law to make false testimony to the court in many contexts.

But again, happy to chat through this offline.

We also just always note when we're talking about ERPO that when you're providing outreach and education and training and you're thinking about what you're funding, to make sure that there's really clear distinctions between ERPOs and domestic violence protection orders.

I come from a victim services background, and the last thing I would ever want to see is a victim or survivor getting an ERPO when what they really need is a domestic violence protection order. And I would also never want to see someone petitioning for an ERPO in a way that is not victim centered. We want to make sure that we're respecting survivors' autonomy and their own needs to a safety plan and keep themselves safe while making sure that firearms are taken away from those that are a known risk to themselves or others.

So just always want to raise that and happy to chat this through with any of you in your states or to talk about it with any [inaudible 03:12:27] grantees as well. But it's something that we would really encourage you to think about when you're messaging around ERPOs.

Next slide, please.

So we just wanted to highlight some of the lessons we're seeing around the country that there's great variation among and within states in regards to uptake. I live in Maryland, which I believe is the only state to our knowledge that's had an ERPO petition in every county around the state. But some states with ERPO laws, we're seeing thousands of petitions, and some states we're not really seeing any.

And so there's a lot of difference in uptake and how it's being implemented. But the hope is that by really tailoring your efforts, you can see potentially an increase in ERPO petitions. It's not like there's a magic number we're looking to see, but making sure that this is a tool being used to reduce gun violence in your state.



We're typically seeing most petitioners as law enforcement around the country. We know that a lot of state statutes include clinicians as petitioners or family members, but in most jurisdictions, we're still seeing law enforcement petitioning for ERPOs.

I think a lot of that has to do with the challenges for clinicians in taking time out of their medical practice to go to court and petition and present evidence, and potentially hire an attorney. It comes much more naturally, I think, for law enforcement agencies to be petitioners.

The same with family members. I think there's oftentimes some hurdles for family members to petition for an ERPO against a loved one.

So that's something to think about if you're trying to increase petitions by a certain group in your state, that this is what we're seeing nationally, these trends.

The evidence though in regards to ERPO is overwhelmingly positive. We're seeing ERPOs being used in response to mass shooting threats, suicide threats, interpersonal violence, including domestic violence. And the research is incredibly, incredibly promising when it comes to ERPOs. We know that for every 10 to 20 firearms removed in an ERPO case, we're seeing a life saved. And the more research that's coming out is, again, showing the promise of ERPO.

We also know that implementation tends to come most at the local level. So where we see ERPO numbers the highest and where we see ERPO really succeeding around the country is when you have a local champion or champions who are really leading the charge and have created systems on the local level and have educated folks on the local level so that everyone knows who to call, who to petition, what to expect, and to make sure that it's just a well-oiled machine at that local level where these orders are being served.

But we also see sometimes those models then being implemented across the state.

Next slide, please.

So we wanted to talk a little bit about the key infrastructure that we see as being really pivotal at the state and local levels in order to make your ERPO program succeed.

So one thing that's really valuable is designating a statewide ERPO coordinator. This individual can help make sure that jurisdictions at the local level are getting the information they need; they can help with statewide distribution of forms, as well as training.

It's also helpful to create a statewide ERPO task force potentially to look at what's happening around the state and bring together those different system actors like we've been talking about earlier today, courts, law enforcement, behavioral health specialists, and others, to coordinate on ERPO implementation around the state.

A statewide data collection is also really critical. If you don't have a statewide data collection process, then it might be stratified in different jurisdictions around your state and very hard to get the data for who is petitioning, what are the grounds for the petitions, what the makeup of the respondents is. But having that statewide data collection and getting all of your databases from the courts and law enforcement to communicate with one another in a really seamless fashion is really valuable; especially at the beginning. It's much harder to build the airplane while you're flying, right?

We also want to note that in a lot of places there could be increased awareness of ERPO laws, but we want to emphasize the need for targeted education and outreach efforts. What we're seeing around the



country is that most of the times when someone is in crisis, they're reaching out to 911 or 988 or some other resource, and then that resource is connecting them with the most appropriate remedy, whether that's a mental health hold, an ERPO, a domestic violence advocate, whatever it is. Right?

And so it's really helpful if you're training clinicians, if you're training law enforcement, if you're training courts and clerks on successful ERPO implementation and talking about it, but we want to really target that outreach and focus. And then it's also helpful to consider options for a state law enforcement agency to file those ERPO petitions.

Next slide, please.

And then at the local level, when you're thinking about that pass-through funding, it's really helpful to designate a point person in law enforcement agencies or in prosecutor's offices to run point on ERPOs.

Spencer Cantrell:

And prosecutors' offices to run point on ERPOs. It's one thing to file the ERPO and then to get the final ERPO, but it's another thing to have a point person who's bringing in the appropriate social services and who's looking at the ERPOs when they expire and determining whether or not those ERPOs should be extended potentially if there is an ongoing risk. And so having those leads and someone that's looking at what's coming through, looking at where there were missed opportunities for ERPOs at the local level, making sure that that local training is happening and being replicated is all very valuable. It's also helpful to designate dedicated ERPO judges. We know that that's not possible in all courts across the country, but where you can have someone who's really familiar with not just the statute but the resources that go along with an ERPO to make it not just about removing the firearms, but addressing the underlying needs that led to the crisis.

It's also valuable to have a local ERPO working group or coordinator to facilitate cooperation among those key partners. I know I might sound like a bit of a broken record, but for this to be successful, you really do need to bring together a lot of different system actors and you want to make sure that law enforcement is talking with other behavioral health providers and judges. These are still relatively new and having that coordination can go a long way. We've also seen some really fantastic models where you have a local advocate who's working to help with respondents and civilians involved in the ERPO process. So providing information and guidance to respondents, providing information about how to relinquish their firearms, what other services might be available, what to expect in the process. Making sure that everyone is very informed about what's going on, and an advocate is a great way to do that.

It's helpful to have a local ERPO training curriculum. It's one thing to know the law in your jurisdiction, but it's another thing to know where do you go in the courthouse? Where does this form live? What's the box you have to make sure that you check on page three? What do you need to expect when you're going to court? Whose number do you call if you're not sure if the order's been served properly? You want to have that local training curriculum that gets into those nuts and bolts and then implementing protocols to make sure that information is shared with the FBI for NCIC or the next background checks or with your state databases if you're a partial point of contact state. Next slide please.

And then we just want to make sure where you can, that you're building out transparency and accountability. I think those are really valuable, especially with a newer program with this fantastic funding that can be used for implementation or other purposes, that you're creating guidelines, like I said, for data collection, but sharing that information with folks around your state and creating a process



for reviewing and looking at what are we doing well, what are our successes and what are some opportunities that we might have in the future? And here I've included an advisory report that one state published looking at the usage of ERPO in their state and then a data dashboard from a county in Virginia that's doing a really great job with ERPO and publishing their findings. So I'm going to turn it back over to Lisa now to just talk for a couple minutes about what TTA we can provide, but we really hope that you'll reach out to us and we can continue to work with all of you.

Lisa Geller:

Thank you. I promise we're almost done. I will just touch on at the end some of the TTA that we are providing and can provide on the next slide, Allison. So these are some of the folks we are working with, have worked with. I will also say we are coordinating closely with NCJFCJ already. So please, especially if you're talking about court based programs and talking about judicial outreach, judicial education, please reach out to both of us. We like to coordinate together and make sure that we're sharing these relationships as well. So on this slide you can see some of the folks that we're providing training and technical assistance to obviously Byrne SCIP grantees. And then beyond that, we know that ERPOs take a village, for lack of a better term, so we need to partner with law enforcement, with prosecutors, attorneys, judges, clinicians, victim services providers, et cetera.

All the categories listed on here and more to make sure that we're addressing this holistically because it's really not enough to just say, "Oh, we're going to focus our efforts on training law enforcement," if the other pieces aren't in place. So just reference these slides if you're curious about the TTA we're providing, and especially if it's judicial focus, please also include NCJFCJ on that outreach. And then again, just more specifically, these are some questions we've gotten asked to review state plans to talk about best practices, especially if you're new to ERPO and not sure where to focus your efforts. If you are in a state like Michigan and Minnesota that their legislation just went into effect earlier this year in January and February, that could be something you want to focus on, those promising practices from around the country. In addition to the TTA we're providing, we will have an implementation website that you all can reference.

We have toolkits, guides, asynchronous synchronous trainings. We'll be launching a community of practice that's going to raise up the next generation of extremist protection order implementers by learning from those that are currently doing great work in the field. And of course, we are responsive daily to training and technical assistance. So I think our last slide just has our contact information. Yes. Thank you. You can scan this report. I know in the ERPO breakout talked about some of those promising practices that we've seen around the country. In this report that Spencer and I authored with two colleagues at Everytown, we talked specifically about where this funding can be used and cite and referenced jurisdictions that are already doing these model policies. So scan that. Spencer put a link in the chat and thank you, thank you for listening to us and our contact info is on the next slide.

Allison Badger:

Awesome. Thank you so much. I am going to pass the mic to Angie from the PPI team who's going to talk briefly, well, as fast as she can on the PMT measures. And then we are getting really close to letting you all get back to your lives, but I promise it's worth it to stay. And Angie?

Angela Balchi :



Thank you, Allison. And yeah, I will preface that this is an overview. This isn't the last time you'll be hearing from me. There'll probably be more specific performance measure trainings off to the side where we'll go deeper dive. So definitely don't get overwhelmed by the information here as I try to keep us within the time. So again, I'm Angie Balchi. Thank you everyone for sticking around for the last part of the afternoon. I'm a senior research associate with the planning performance and impact team, and I'm going to cover topics related to performance management at BJA. So we'll get into what you need to report, when and where reporting happens, and reporting best practices. Next slide.

So overall, what is performance management at BJA? Performance management is the process of grantees, you, regularly collecting data on your grant activities and so that we can determine whether you're implementing your activities as intended and having the desired goals and objectives. So BJA has established performance measures for each grant program, and they were included in the original solicitation that you responded to. So you should be familiar there, or some of you may have already begun reporting for this solicitation award. You can find additional information and resources on performance measures at the two links at the bottom of this page, and that will just provide a big additional spot to go to for questions and resources. Next slide. So why does BJA use performance measures? Well, there are many purposes and benefits of performance measures not only to BJA, but also you and your program and your organization.

Performance measures allow BJA to look at the grant program, Byrne SCIP, holistically, but also at local and state levels to identify areas of success and possible opportunities for improvement in the grant program. This also helps us to help training and technical assistance, resources, and getting them to the localities that need them the most. Additionally, our BJA receives a lot of data requests from Congress, White House and other entities, and we rely on the data that you provide to us in order to accurately respond to those inquiries. Also, on an annual basis, we collect data from you and report on key performance indicators to leadership. And this has helped to formulate budget decisions for programming. And finally, DOJ is required to collect these performance measures by law, including the Data Act and the Great Act among others. On the next slide, but there are also many benefits to you as the grantee to regularly track and review your own data.

And so you can do this by reviewing the performance measures required in addition to other data that you collect on your own. And this can lead to increased sustainability of your program by ensuring that you are identifying successes, but also identifying challenges and areas of improvement early on in your grant award. Next slide. So now we'll just get into the who, what, where, when, and how of grant performance measurement reporting. The next slide. So what data do I have to report? You can find the link to the Byrne SCIP performance measure questionnaire on this slide in addition to more information on performance measures at the OJP website listed under that. And we encourage you if you haven't already, to become familiar with the measures before you begin reporting on them. And you can also use this PDF version linked here to help you track your data.

And so that way when the reporting period comes time to report in the PMT, you already have your data ready for entry. Next slide. The performance measurement tool or the PMT is the online data collection tool for the Byrne SCIP program, and you can access the PMT by the last link on the page. The PMT itself also contains a lot of information and resources that may be useful to you during your reporting period. And then we also have linked here the JustGrants website page. After you complete your report in the PMT, you'll upload a PDF document of your report into JustGrants. The next slide shows a really helpful reporting table timeline so that you know when you're going to be reporting data



about and when your report is due. And so Byrne SCIP grantees report their data quarterly, so in January, April, July and October in the PMT.

And then in the second column data required you can see alternating values of performance measures and narrative questions. And you will only report on narrative questions semi-annually or January and July as well as your last period of grant activity. And then also note that reports are due 30 days after the end of a reporting period in the third column, PMT deadline. And then the final column upload to JustGrants indicates when you have to upload your semi-annual reports PDF into JustGrants. And that aligns with the semi-annual narrative reporting timeline on the next slide. So this is an overview outline of the Byrne SCIP questionnaire structure, and I'll get into it more in depth. But here you can see the categories of questions that will be required. And if you're not conducting activities in a certain area, the questionnaire is set up in a way that if you click yes or no, the survey will direct you to the appropriate set of questions that you should answer.

And as I mentioned, there are two types of questions and data that you'll be reporting, performance measures and the semi-annual narrative questions. Next slide. And so after you answer some initial questions regarding your general award administration, such as if you had grant activity within the award, then you'll get into the first section, which is partnership activities. And this relates to the Byrne SCIP requirement to establish a crisis intervention program advisory board. And so if you have not yet established the board within the reporting period that you are responding to, then you'll just explain what steps are being taken to establish the board. On the next slide, crisis intervention program section. And so here grantees will respond to a list of program activities that took place during the reporting period and indicate whether you're using grant program funds to either implement a new program or the enhancement of an existing program.

You can provide additional activities in the other row if you need. And then after that you'll respond to an open-ended question on measures that were taken to safeguard constitutional rights. Again, if you have already begun reporting measures, this question has been revised as of the end of the year and the PMT will notify you of that. So just be aware that the question wording has changed slightly. Next major section just to take note of is the extreme risk protection order section. And so if you did not use funds to carry out ERPOs during the reporting period, you'll respond no to skip that section. And then the second part of the ERPO section only applies to court based ERPO programs. So if you're not a court based project, you would just select not a court based ERPO project to skip those set of questions.

And then finally, as I mentioned on the next slide, narrative questions are responded to only in January and July, but these allow you to report on your overall goals and accomplishments towards your overall Byrne SCIP program, but also an opportunity to identify any barriers you've encountered and any TTA needs that you may have. Next slide. And so to best respond to the semi-annual narrative questions, it's best to regularly revisit the goals and objectives that you set forth in your solicitation application. And to do that, always keep in mind the SMART mnemonic that goals should be specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time bound. And so as you review and answer your semi-annual narrative goals, go back and reflect on your goals and objectives and update as needed. The next slide has some examples of defining goals and objectives with the right side being SMART based with specificity and timeliness.

And next slide. Just some overall tips on data quality as you get started with your program from the very beginning, designating a staff person to coordinate all performance measure data collection and data entry, becoming familiar with the questionnaire through the PDF link shared and also attending trainings



like this or future performance measure specific trainings, ensuring there is a backup person in case the coordinator is on leave or leaves the organization. Also work with your sub-grantees from the beginning to determine who will be reporting data. Also review and validate your sub-grantee data before submission and any questions that may not be relevant to a sub-grantee and the performance measures, they can either skip that question using skip logic or enter zeros for things that may not be relevant to them. But if you have any questions related to data entry or navigating the PMT or which questions are relevant to you, always feel free to reach out to the PMT help desk and we'll get you some direct training there.

And really quickly before I turn it over, as a good segue, Byrne SCIP data spotlight. So as mentioned again, the performance data that you provide to us is used regularly and so we're always looking at it and providing it out and reporting out to leadership and congressional reports and other requirements by us. And so just to look into the data so far, as of the fiscal year close in fiscal year 2023, again grantees are still, everyone's still ramping up grant activity, but 20% of the 51 Byrne SCIP prime recipients have indicated in the PMT that they have initiated funding activity or droned down and started expending funds in addition to their ongoing planning activities. And so in the box on the right, we have just some tidbits of data to see where programs are working so far related to the types of projects. So far, most active grantees are reporting that funding will support other types of crisis intervention programs and initiatives.

And so some examples grantees mentioned were behavioral health deflection trainings, gun violence and safety outreach, among others, and then specialized court based programs and extreme risk protection orders were after that. And the three most commonly reported partners that are engaged in the advisory board have been victim services, behavioral healthcare providers and community members. And again, so all this data that you report to us is being looked at and used. And so segue is this data is being used to populate a Byrne SCIP data dashboard, which is forthcoming and really interactive way to look at performance measure data so far. So I'll turn it back over to NCJA to give us a preview of that and just again, this is our BJAPMT help desk, contact information, and additional resources. Again, feel free to reach out by email or phone with any questions. Thanks, Allison.

Allison Badger:

Thank you, Angie. That was amazing. You did that in such an efficient manner, such important information. I'm going to pass it to Mike on our team to talk about the dashboards and then we will get ready to wrap this up for you all.

Mike Fargen:

Sure. Thank you Allison. Hi everybody, I'm Mike Fargen and I oversee the NCJA data center. Also a great job, Angie, getting through all the important work that the PPI team is doing. So what you're looking at right now is a dashboard that we've developed at MCJ Data Center with the SCIP information in it. It's not live right now, but it will be available at a later date. One of the main reasons is because we're waiting for that data to become more mature as we go through the program. So it will be available within a secure platform where users will be able to log in and see their information.

But the data visualizations mimic a lot of the ways that the questionnaire that Angie was discussing it mimics the way that that information is actually reported. I know we're on time here, but the main goal



is really just to simply increase access to your own information and statistics about the SCIP measures and activities that are going on in your state. So I'm sure everyone's looking at the clock right now and I'm sure Allison wants to land this thing right at 4:30. So I know we're looking through a few slides here, but more to come on this. And I'm really excited to make this tool available to everybody here. So thank you.

Allison Badger:

Thanks, Mike. Yeah, more to come on the dashboard, more to come on PMT. And wow, this was somehow too long and too short. And so I really appreciate you all hanging in there for this long meeting. But we know there's a lot of great information in here that you all really needed. And so I am quickly putting in a link to the SurveyMonkey. For those of you who have to hop off right at four, please take the evaluation and give us feedback so that we can continuously improve. Most of you all are already aware of this, but we at NCJA can provide TA to you for Byrne SCIP and Byrne JAG. We can help you with your advisory boards. We can help provide support while you're going through your program plans. We can connect you with other peers, send you examples of sub-awards. So please, please don't hesitate to reach out between us, NCJFCJ, Hopkins and BJA, we will get you the answers you need so that you can move through this program in the way that you need to.

And more information, resources and trainings will be coming. We're up and running now, so just be on the lookout. If you are not receiving notifications from us for some reason, please shoot us an email so we can make sure to get you on the list. Next slide please. Just a couple of things coming soon. So there will be a website, a Byrne SCIP website, and that is going to be within the next few months, more resource documents about examples of things that could be good to invest the funding with, grants administration document. And then I'm going to put right here in the chat a way to receive technical assistance, you can also just email us and we'll get you to the right place. And then next slide. We probably don't have time for questions, but you can reach us anywhere you want and we actually, we have time.

Maybe if anyone wants to ask a question, be brave, ask a question, and three hours and 28 minutes into the training. So please feel free to ask any questions or just shoot us an email or make a request. And again, if you're tech-savvy, this is a QR code to the evaluation. It really helps us improve. And I just want to thank BJA, NCJFCJ, the PPI team, the Hopkins team, NCJA and all of you for making this happen. And I hope you all got something out of it and just don't forget to reach out if you have any questions. All right, we landed this bird a minute early. I feel accomplished. Thanks everyone so much and be on the lookout for more to come and we will send the recording out. All right, have a good one.