

Simone Greene:

Good afternoon, or good morning, everyone. Welcome to Braiding Federal Grant Funds for Maximum Impact brought to you by the National Criminal Justice Association. Before we get started, I just want to go through a few housekeeping items. This webinar is being recorded and we will make the slides and the recording as well as a transcription available to you at a later date. If you have not already seen it, we have created a braided funding guide that compliments the information that we will go over today. It is available on the learning management system that you used to sign up for this today and to join us today. We will be also sending that out to the masses as well if you miss it. If you would participate today, we would greatly appreciate that. We have a few polls sprinkled throughout, so we want to hear from you. Then finally, we will have a question and answer portion at the end of this webinar.

We really invite you to submit questions through the Q&A using the Q&A function. All right. To get started, my name is Simone Greene and I am a program manager here at the National Criminal Justice Association. I'm going to start off today just giving an overview of what braided funding is, and then I will pass the mic on to my colleague, Meg Williams, to talk about some steps to the braided funding model. Meg, would you like to introduce yourself?

Meg Williams:

Yeah. Thank you so much, Simone. I'm really happy to be here today. I recently ... Well, not so recent. It feels like it, but I retired from the State of Colorado in July of '19. When I was there, when I left, I was managing probably seven or eight different federal fund grant sources, including JAG and funds from OJJDP. I have a history of collaborating with multiple agencies on projects. I absolutely understand the fear that people have when we talk about braiding funding with federal funds, but it is something that is possible and can be amazing in terms of assisting you and improving outcomes for our families who lead very complicated lives. What I'd like to do is just sort of give you a starter on this today and take it from there when have projects that you think might be a good option for this.

Simone Greene:

Great. Thank you, Meg. All right. We just want to start out acknowledging that this webinar was created with the support of a grant from the Bureau of Justice Assistance. We want to say thank you to BJA for your continued support. What are we here to do today? Our objectives are to discuss why we should focus on leveraging federal funding, define and discuss the value of collaborative models and define braided funding, discuss the important factors for an SAA to consider when contemplating the development of a collaborative funding model with braided funding. Last, but certainly not least, describe the steps to developing a braided funding model. We are going to start out with a quick poll. Do you have experience with braided funding? A simple question, yes or no? I'll give you all a few seconds to respond. (silence)

All right. We have a good response rate here. 35% of you say yes and 65%, no. Hopefully you will leave here today knowing a little bit more about braided funding. Then for those of you who do have experience with braided funding, hopefully we'll be able to teach you something new today. Great. Thank you everyone for participating. All right. Why? Why should we focus on leveraging federal funding? First, one funding source cannot meet the full needs of the criminal justice system. I don't really have to tell you all, but the criminal justice system is complex. There are many moving parts, and there are many priorities to address, and crime does not exist in a vacuum. Siloed funding may really get to the root of what you're trying to address. It may not fully help you to meet your priorities. One way I

think for instance, if an office never funds anything related to substance use, for instance, we know that substance use really, really has a big impact on the criminal justice system.

If you never fund anything related to that, then there may be a missed opportunity to address a key issue, and it may impact your outcomes. Additionally, using multiple funding streams really helps to maximize impact. For instance, when we talk about Byrne JAG, we know that Byrne JAG is finite. You get a certain amount is allocated by the federal government and then that's split into 56 states, and then you whittle it down even more to different sub awards and different jurisdictions that are getting funding, and it's finite. Bringing in other types of relevant funding can really help to make sure that you are maximizing the impact of that money and all the money that is out there. Overall, leveraging funding sources can create efficiencies, improve outcomes, and ultimately save costs. Here are some more reasons why. Let's talk about a system that's been using collaborative funding models for decades, which is workforce. Workforce is funded by multiple agencies, multiple programs, there are different requirements, different purposes.

Like in the criminal justice system, the tools required to meet employment needs are complex and crosses over multiple sectors. They're very, very similar. Congress actually encourages workforce development to leverage different types of funding, and they've been doing it for quite some time. I don't know how many of you have noticed, but even if you look in your Byrne JAG solicitation BJA really, really encourages leveraging different types of funding. They looked at the impact of using a collaborative model in the workforce system and they found that it leads to projects that are more strategic and less siloed, projects that can provide more seamless service delivery and projects that can reduce resource gap. Really all of these reasons can really be translated to the criminal justice system. All right. We know that there can be some challenges with the current funding structure. For instance, there can be a focus on compliance instead of performance or outcomes. There can also be fragmentation, overlap and duplication.

For instance, there are billions of dollars of federal funds supported by thousands of programs with over 100 federal agencies. These programs are giving out money, local level, state level. You have all these different community based organizations giving money. It's really, really a lot of things to manage, there's a lot of people to track. One example that I want to give you about program fragmentation and overlap, the Government Accountability Office, the GAO, is statutorily mandated to annually inform Congress of federal programs, agencies, offices, and initiatives that have duplicative goals or activities. They put out annual reports and they consistently highlight and report on overlap and duplication. For instance, one annual report found that eight federal agencies obligated roughly 2.8 billion to administer 26 homelessness programs. Most of this money was spread out across three agencies, and they found that these agencies offered multiple programs that had similar services, similar populations, and they each had different reporting requirements.

It's really, really easy to see me think about, especially across the board, that if you're not careful, and if there's not a lot of communication, that it's really, really easy to duplicate efforts. Finally, traditional collaborations often involve systems and agencies working together, but each remaining independent within the project. We always, always talk about silos and we know that they can be broken down and it may be hard, but silos are not impossible to overcome. All right. We have a quote here for you. Public funders must work together to make it easier for many more state, local and community providers to use multiple funding streams in order to attain the scale needed to efficiently deliver high quality services that result in meaningful outcomes for their target populations. Here, they're actually talking about early opportunities for disadvantaged children. But the basic premise is the same when we're thinking about the criminal justice system. We need to have the option of bringing multiple sources of funding together to meet the needs of our criminal justice system and ultimately to enhance public safety.

All right. What exactly are braided and blended funding models? We want to make sure that we're talking about the same things here. We're going to define them. To start out, blended versus braided funding. You often hear the terms used interchangeably, but they're actually not the same. It's interesting, even here at NCJA, as we were preparing for this, we kept using these terms interchangeably, my myself included. That's another reason why I thought that it was important really to highlight that these terms are not the same. They're not the same type of model. Both of course, can be legitimate ways of accounting funds, but they have a key difference that we are about to touch upon. Both blended and braided funding involve combining two or more sources or streams of funding. Both can involve multiple organizations or agencies coming together. But blended funding co-mingles funds. Discreet financial and programmatic reporting by source of funds is not possible because the funds have lost their identity and they can no longer track how they're used.

I like to think about the differences by using just the words themselves. Let's take blended. What happens when you blend something? Let's say that I want a smoothie. I want a strawberry banana smoothie. I take my strawberry, I take my banana, maybe some yogurt and I blend it all up. Now I have a delicious and nutritious smoothie. I know that I put a strawberry in there, however, I can't see a strawberry anymore. If I want to take that strawberry out for any reason to look at it or to inspect it, I can no longer do it because it's been blended up. Now think about what happens when you braid something. You take your three strands and then you braid them together and now you have braided hair. But let's say that I want to inspect a strand of hair. Well, I can take that out and I can inspect it now, because it's just been braided in. It has not been blended in. That strand of hair, because it's been braided, it still maintains its identity.

That's just a simple way that I like to think about it, and I hope that that's helpful for you as well. All right. Braided funding is when groups, groups multiple funding streams towards one purpose while separately tracking and reporting on each funding source and funds are managed by the recipient agency. All right. We have another poll coming up for you. A quick concept check in to see if we sort of understand the differences between braided and blended funding. Which of these statements is true about braided and blended funding? A, both involve combining two or more sources or sources of funding to support a program or activity. B, blended funding combines or commingles multiple funding streams for one purpose without continuing to differentiate or track individual sources. C, braided funding groups multiple funding streams toward one purpose while separately tracking and reporting on each source of funding. Both start with B, or E, all of the above. I will give you a few seconds to respond to this concept check in.

All right. The answer is E, all of the above. Of course they both all start with B, but they also both involve combining two more sources of funding to support a program. Blended funding combines or commingles funds, and braided funding groups multiple funding streams towards one purpose while separately tracking. All right. Thank you everyone for participating in that poll. Now we know what braided funding is. There are some challenges, of course, that can come with braided funding, and funding requirements is one of those. So funding streams inherently have attached to them and agree to meet certain goals related to missions. Sometimes you have certain populations that you have to serve. There are specific performance indicators and outcomes that you have to track. That really leads to detailed tracking. Sometimes tracking can be difficult. When you're tracking all these different requirements, it can be difficult. That also leads us to resources. You need to have a robust accounting system.

I will say, most of you already probably have a pretty robust accounting system in place because you administer many different grants and so you already have a robust system in place. You're just using it in a different way. We also understand that resources, for instance, in the form of skilled staff can be hard. Grants management can be complex and you really need skilled staff who have a high level of

attention to detail. It's something that it is really important when you are not only in grants management, but especially when you are using a braided funding model. Why isn't it done more often? It really comes down to all of this tracking and the rules that come with braided funding. There are laws, rules, and regulations placed on federal grant awards, and you don't want to mess up. You want to be compliant. It can be intimidating, but we're sort of here to tell you, don't be intimidated. You can do this, and braided funding really is a way to maximize the impact that you are trying to accomplish. All right.

I'm going to delve a little bit to some important factors for an SAA to consider when we're considering a braided funding model. We want to talk about strategic planning and we want to talk a little bit about financial management. Strategic planning is likely not new to you all. I hope that I'm not telling you something new when I let you know that as part of your Byrne JAG application process, you are required to create a strategic plan. But as a whole, many organizations do organization-wide strategic plans or system-wide criminal justice strategic plans. As you think about strategic plan and you start that process, that is a place and that's a time for you to really start considering if braided funding is appropriate for what you're trying to accomplish. One way to do this is, as you're starting strategic planning, starting the conversation and engaging with stakeholders is super, super key. You should identify who your stakeholders are and engage with them. You can survey them, you can bring them together for more in depth conversations. You can focus group them. Many states have different boards.

For instance, when you're thinking about what's stakeholders to include, of course, grants like Byrne JAG, there are people who are required to be a part of that process, for instance, law enforcement or community corrections. But there are other people that you should be thinking about that may not be required, for instance, maybe behavioral health. Or think about the people and the agencies that you interact with and you collaborate with and you just have conversations with on a regular basis. Or are there any agencies or partners that you are on other boards with that you think may be appropriate to be part of your strategic planning process to really start thinking about whether or not braiding funding is appropriate. These stakeholders, as well as looking at previous strategic plans or bringing in data, can, can really help you to identify your priorities. Identifying priorities will not only help you to determine where funding should be spent, but it also helps you to think about other types of funding that may align with these priorities. That really leads to knowing what's available.

Now you know what your priorities are, so are there any other funding streams that may align with those priorities? Really this is really, really, really where these stakeholders are so important because they can really help to determine what's available. What other types of funding are available? Or are the people that you're bringing in, do they administer any other types of funding that may be appropriate to your priorities? For instance, there are so, so, so many federal resources available. For instance, there are lots of resources available for substance use disorder, there are resources for victims' assistance. Can you leverage any of the other dollars that are out there to really make the greatest impact? A takeaway here is really about engaging stakeholders. Engaging stakeholders and building rapport with other agencies and funders is really key to a successful braided funding initiative. We'll get a little bit more into this later on when Meg is speaking with you. We're going to go through some requirements to note and some other sort of financial mandates.

I just want to add that we're giving sort of a high level view, and we're not giving a super exhaustive list because we could be here for days. But we just thought that these things that are coming up were some important things to highlight. For instance, you probably already have a pretty good idea in understanding of what requirements that you need to note. For instance, note the applicable law of your jurisdiction or the DOJ financial guide is your friend. You want to note other programmatic and technical requirements, so award conditions, special conditions, any sort of requirements that are

contained in program specific guidelines, you want to look at 2 CFR Part 200, other applicable laws. It could really vary based on the jurisdiction that you're in. When we're talking about financial management, this really highlights when we're talking about how you want to track everything. All recipients and subrecipients are required to establish and maintain adequate accounting systems and financial records and to accurately account for funds awarded to them.

Recipients must have a financial management system in place that is able to record and report on the received obligation and expenditure of grant funds. This is really when we're talking about you want to be able to track, this is why we're talking about braided funding and not blended because remember you don't have any more strawberries to pull from if these are blended up. All right. The things that you want to track, just to highlight a few, you want to track the federal awards awarded. You want federal funds drawn down, matching funds, program income, subawards, contracts expensed against the award, expenditures, and performance measures. Here we'll just want to highlight commingling and how commingling really is something that you don't want to do, and that's not what braided funding is. Although physical segregation of cash deposits is not required, the accounting systems of all recipients and subrecipients must ensure that agency funds are not commingled with funds from other federal or private agencies.

You want separate accounting, no commingling funds on a program by program or project by project basis. Funds specifically budgeted and/or received for one project may not be used to support another. You want a system to adequately track funds according to each budget category. Honestly, so many of these things are things that you already do. Which sort of shows that you were already set up to use a braided funding model. Supplanting. Supplanting, I think is something that comes up a lot when we talk about using multiple types of funding because it's something that people want to be very, very intentional about not doing. Supplanting is to deliberately reduce state or local funds because of the existence of federal funds. For example, when state funds are appropriated for a stated purpose and federal funds are awarded for that same purpose, the state replaces its state funds with federal funds, thereby reducing the total amount available for the stated purpose. One key here is deliberate as well. We have a few scenarios that have coming up and the scenario will appear on the screen and I'll read it to you.

I want you all to tell me if it is supplanting, yes or no. We have some participation coming up here. All right. Supplanting scenario number one. State funds are appropriated to hire 50 new police officers and federal funds are awarded for hiring 60 new police officers. At the end of the year, the state has hired 60 new police officers and the federal funds have been exhausted. The state has not used its funds towards hiring new officers, but instead reduce its appropriation for that purpose and assign or appropriated the funds to another purpose. All right. Is this supplanting, yes or no?

(silence)

All right. You are all correct. This is indeed supplanting. In this case, the state has supplanted its appropriation with the federal funds. If supplanting had not occurred, 110 new officers would've been hired using federal funds for 60 officers and state funds for 50. All right. Great. Thank you very much, everyone. All right. We have our next scenario here. All right. Supplanting scenario number two. A municipality has a full-time police officer on staff who's salary and benefits are budgeted for and paid from local and state funds. The police department's Byrne JAG application created a communications officer position, however, due to an unanticipated hiring freeze, they are unable to fill the position. Some of the communications responsibilities are added to the police officer's workload. Can Byrne JAG funding be used to pay for the officer's time? If you use Byrne JAG funding to pay for some of the officer's time, is this an example of supplanting or not?

(silence)

All right. This actually is an example of supplanting. Even though he or she takes on the communications duties, JAG funds cannot be used to pay for his or her salary. To do so would be supplanting since other local and state funds were already budgeted to cover 100% of the officer's time. Yes, thank you, Michelle, this is a good point that it depends. If the officer receives additional compensation, the compensation that was not already in the state and local budget, then that is not supplanting. But if it's just their regular salary that was already accounted for in a different budget, then it would be supplanting. Thank you for making that determination or that point. Thank you. All right. Then one more scenario just for good measure. All right. A county has a part-time community outreach worker who works 20 hours per week in neighborhood X, and is paid with state funds. Under a collaborative project using federal JAG funds, this worker begins to take on responsibility for managing the outreach efforts in neighborhood Y. Increasing or her work week from 20 to 40 hours.

Would it be supplanting to pay for the workers 20 hours per week in neighborhood Y using JAG funds? Is this an example of supplanting, yes or no?

(silence).

All right. Correct. Yes, this is correct. This is not an example of supplanting. This sort of speaks to the previous example, which is, this is additional compensation. This is not something that was already budgeted in a different budget, and so this is why this is not an example of supplanting. Thank you everyone for participating in those scenarios. I think that was a little bit of fun. I hope you had some fun too. All right. Just a few more things that we wanted to highlight before we really dig into some steps of braided funding. Be aware of potentially duplicative funding. This is when we talk about communication. We spoke about that earlier, the overlap and the duplication, how easy that could be because there's just so much funding going around. This is really something just to be aware of and this is where good communication comes into play. If you believe that there's duplicative funding just per DOJ financial guide guidelines notify DOJ.

Some takeaways from this is, the key to braided funding is that the funds never lose their identity, allowing tracking from planning to final evaluation to be aware of commingling, supplanting and report potentially duplicative funding to DOJ. We want you to communicate, communicate, communicate. That's so, so important. To document, document, document, document everything that you can. You will be required to document those as well. This was a brief overview of braided funding, and of course not exhaustive because we could be here forever. But I hope that you have a pretty good understanding now of what braided funding is. I'm going to pass the baton over to Meg to talk about steps for developing a braided funding model.

Meg Williams:

Thank you. You did excellent. You are very good. Thank you again. The steps for developing a braided funding model. These conversations about braiding began as early as 2004. It was an association of government accountants that had an intergovernmental partnership that brought in high level state and federal folks to really look at how are they going to improve services that they're providing and the use of their funding, basically improve their performance. They then determined that breeding with a collaborative process is possible and encouraged, but recognized the complexity of the process, and so they provided broad guidance. It hasn't been done a lot. I would say that there are some states that have embraced it and done very well. Like Simone was saying, some federal agencies are way ahead of the game. I'm hoping that we can really start doing that in our criminal justice arena because I believe that we've seen when it works well in the juvenile arena. I'd like to see the same sort of outcomes for adults.

How do you get started? Well, you really need to start with a clear vision. Once you have that vision, you really need to understand what are your resources, what are you bringing to the table and what is everyone bringing? You need to have a strategy that maximizes those resources. We will be going through all this. Focus on your outcomes. Please, one of the things that I think happens with federal funding, because there's such a strong push to make sure that we are accountable to the funding, is we focus on compliance less than we do on outcomes. I'd really like to see that shift happen. This is a way that we might be able to make that happen. We obviously need to engage our stakeholders and you need to be able to collect data to provide the feedback on the strategies. If you feel like any of these would be a no, we're not there yet, then you need to step back and go and start at the beginning again. The next slide talks about, are we clear about the scope and the goals of the collaborative project? Do we have a ...

What do you call it? A 20 second elevator speech. Can we really clearly articulate what the scope of the project is and what we're trying to achieve? That's going to be critically important as we get better or get further along. Have we identified our partners? Have we verified that let's bring partners to the table. But we need them to also come to the table saying, "We've checked it out, and yes, we can work in a braided funding model. We are coming to the table open to looking at how this might work." Do they already have projects going that align with the goals that you're trying to do? Those are great projects to bring in because you're really aligning things for similar work. Here's a big one. Can you tolerate the risks involved with bringing certain partners in? We all know agencies who are not very good at what they do and not very good at grant management and make mistakes and have findings sometimes have to return federal dollars. Those are not necessarily the partners that you want to take a risk on.

Although, at times, it may be crucial that you do and you have to just mitigate that risk and build that into your process. But really look at the risk that they would bring to the table. Do we understand their culture? You know agencies that really are not collaborators. They just don't have that framework and they just don't know how to do it or don't do it well. I could name certain agencies, but it's not necessarily a national perspective. Every state agency has a different perspective. You'll know some that you would say, "No, I don't think it's going to be possible." But others that you know do and are wanting to. You want to look again, do they have some financial and programmatic management? Then you need to look for a cognizant agency. Now that's the agency that's going to be taking the funds, all the different funds and bringing them together. But not, in this [inaudible 00:38:31] not commingling, but bringing them all to one agency and tracking them independently.

So that you have one place where the funding is housed, that maintains information on exactly what's been spent on the project from all the different lens of the different partners. The other thing that you might really think about, and I really, especially with BJA, I loved working with BJA because they were really open. I would bring them in as early as possible to really let them see how you're planning. They may or may not be able to do it before funding is provided. But given that you probably would want to write an application for funding that would note that you want to do a braided funding process, then have them be a partner so that they understand all that you're setting up in order to really make sure that we're doing it correctly, or you are doing it correctly. Have you just determined that you have collectively the resources to meet your goals. You really have to think about what is it we're going to try and accomplish and what is it that we need, and really ask each partner to really assess whether or not in their estimation there is enough resources.

Because every agency has a different perspective. The other thing you really want to make sure of is, if there are matching funding requirements, making sure that those requirements can be met as well. What are your challenges and obstacles? There will be. There always are even if you're not braiding funding. How can we address those? Are there any legal impediments to any of the funding streams?

Can we either adapt to them? Can we ask for a waiver? Waivers are possible at the federal level? Sometimes it will require Congress to make that a possibility, but sometimes there are agencies who have some level of discretion. Always asking and not assuming the answer will always be no on something that you need. I think even more critically is, do we really understand what it is that we are trying to accomplish? How will we know when we've met our goals? We need to agree across agencies that these are our outcomes that we're trying to achieve, and this is how we're going to measure them. Now, you also will have measures that are required, as Simone had said, from every fund source.

They're all going to tell you, "These are the things we need you to measure." You will have those. But collectively, what are the measures that will tell you you've been successful as a collaboration? In Colorado, we were really lucky and have seen a lot of work on looking at braided funding. One of the organizations was key in putting together key principles. Next slide. Before conducting a braided funding planning process there are four real things that I really want you to think about would you be able to pull this together? First is leadership and collaboration. Again, having a core group of leaders that provide a high level of commitment, policy makers or directors of agencies or executive directors of agencies. These are the people that will say, "I support the concept. I still need to see more." That's always going to be the case, but they will empower their staff. They will encourage, if not tell their staff, "You will collaborate." Sometimes that is necessary. Excuse me. They also need to be willing to see some control.

If they are not going to be the cognizant agency that takes in all the funding, then are they willing to see control of the funds that they normally would be using within their financial grant management system having much more control? Are they willing to share goals and their principles and outcomes on this collaborative? That again, typically you set your own and you move forward working independently. The next step is collaborative planning. Again, sometimes you're going to find some agencies that are already maximizing their budgets. They use it down to the penny. They're going to be resistant. But sometimes if you really encourage them by saying, "By bringing more resources to the table, by expanding what we are trying to do, we can be much more flexible in how we are doing things and provide a more comprehensive complementary services for the clients that we're collaboratively trying to serve." By bringing them early into the collaborative planning process, they'll begin to see how this works and how this process can really help them actually improve their outcomes as well.

Then leveraging and maximizing different funding is obviously a big component of this. There's two parts to this. First, the collaboration itself needs to understand the resources that each agency can bring to the table. For example, one of the services that I'm familiar with is High Fidelity Wraparound services, often used in the behavioral health system and child welfare arena because it really brings support to families in a way that typical case management doesn't. All right. Many of the clients who are Medicaid eligible and obviously are needing case management, Medicaid, they don't have it in their toolbox. They're not using and reboarding or paying back for wraparound services. How can we go to that fund source and say, "This is exactly what you're trying to do. It's called something different, but let us show you what it does and try and get it into the toolbox of things that could be reimbursed." You'll find that in different parts of the system. Always be thinking of creative ways to help expand the funding.

Then the second part is, you need to establish a funding inventory. Really go out there and scour your state, what block grants come in, what entitlement programs are there. Sometimes we don't even think about the entitlement programs and they over the years have gotten to be quite flexible. We just need to know that and know how that can happen because many of our clients will be eligible for those programs. Look for obviously discretionary grants, formula grants, and private funding. Then the fourth principle, outcomes and accountability. I can't say this enough, really bring everyone together so that we all understand what it is we're trying to accomplish and how we're going to be accountable for

accomplishing that and what are we going to measure. In the case of when you're looking at projects that involve human beings, clients, we really need to bring them to the table. If you're talking about a program for kids, bring in youth or kids and their families to help you understand what will they feel is success. If you're working with clients exiting adult prison, get with them and say, "What will success look like for you?"

It really does build in buy-in from people as well when it's something that they're part of a program that they really think, "If I can do this, that will really help me." Don't forget to bring them to the table. There are a couple of phases that I want to go through now. The first phase is identifying your vision and your partners. This really is something that you can do through your strategic planning process. What you're doing is basically you're saying, what is it that are the biggest issues and needs in our state from my criminal and/or juvenile perspective? What are the problems that we're facing that they're facing? What is making it so that they're not being successful? Including identifying gaps, and what information do you need to really understand what those gaps are and why they exist and how they might be met? If your program is to fund needed services, here's one thing that some people don't even think about. All the agencies who are currently providing services, what data did they have about the clients that tell you what their levels of need are?

Generally, if it's a service that you're providing, you're going to do some sort of assessment of need so that you're giving them the right services, even in your own singular fund process or program. If you bring on the assessments from all the multiple agencies that are thinking of coming together, you're going to have a much more holistic picture because they're going to come from ... It could be from a behavioral health perspective. What are the needs? What are they struggling with? It can be, is it a substance uses or is it a mental health issue? If they're struggling with employment, you have employment at the table, there's barriers to helping them to be able to really get employed and successfully. This will really help you sort of understand the whole program that you're going to want to try and do. The other thing I always want to remind people is, you've heard of the with them. What's in it for me? When you're bringing people to the table, agencies, and when I say agencies, they are people, and so everybody comes with a need. That there's a reason.

They might come out of the goodness of their heart, but generally they're looking for something as well. Such as maybe improving their outcomes by coming to the table. You need to figure out what's in it for them. How can make sure that this is something that is a value to them and how can we make it so that everyone who comes ... Because it's a process that maybe really unfamiliar and uncomfortable at first, but go ahead and do it. As you increase the number of agencies and/or funding streams that come in, it gets a lot more complex. You really will want to take the time to understand their needs, their interests, their parameters. Again, using your strategic planning principles and your practices can really help sort of bring that out so that everyone is aware of all the other partners and what they require to do this. You're setting yourself up for success by doing it and doing it early in the game as possible, so that you're building off of something that is a shared common understanding about where you're going or want to go.

Phase two then is define your program. What would the program looked like? Have you addressed, what are the processes or services or service locations? What are the transportation needs potentially? What staff are going to be required? What are the qualifications necessary for the staff? What's our infrastructure need? Really beginning that process of identifying those, you're starting to really get into the details and really making sure that you stay on track and don't start expanding populations or maybe even reducing them. Stick with what you planned in terms of the first step and identifying what you're trying to do. Then seek consensus to try and get all of the agencies to really have part of the discussions about what the program is going to look like. Continually assess and reassess because as you know, we learn so much by going through this process that we may not have known

before. This is a positive process to go through. It could mean that your program does get amended from what it originally looked like. That's not necessarily a negative.

It just means that you need to have everyone there to really honestly have the discussion about why we might be doing that. Sometimes using a facilitator's really helpful. That way, no one agency is deriving the process. Excuse me. That might be something you would want to consider doing. I'm sure all of you guys have people at your fingertips because my guess is you've used facilitators in the past. Then phase three, explore your financing options. What are the funding streams that already support either the population or the services that you've talked about including in the program that you're developing? Are they federal, state or local dollars? Are there non-profits who are coming to the table and they have their own funds. Again, looking at the financial and the fiscal and other stuff who really bring them to the table. When we're talking about bringing a fund source to the table, it's important to have both the people who are familiar with the programmatic side of that fund and the fiscal side. Because we need to know their nitty-gritty about what can be funded and what absolutely cannot be funded.

What are some of the other things that are important to know? Many grant programs have little perks that you would not even think about and you need to know them so that you're building your tracking system to make sure that you're accommodating whatever that is. Maybe it's a no-no to do a particular service. You've got to make sure that you're not using money from that fund sourced or that service that may be a critical service in your program, but it cannot be from this particular program. So knowing that. You really need to set up your process for documenting expenses and even recording requirements that are going to be impossible or important to elaborate with everyone. Have everyone familiar with that. I would also, if I was lead on a project like this, I would actually be meeting financial grant guidance documents from each of the fund sources that we were intending to use. Because that will then help me understand, there's going to be some overlap in the rules and regulations, statutes, et cetera, but there's going to be some differences.

For me, it's helpful for me to understand it, and then I know to plan for that and put it in the model. That'll be important. Are there any untapped funding streams once you're starting to do this? Or let's say you have an agency or a funding stream that you were anticipating being a partner. For whatever reason, they have to bow out. Maybe they weren't as appropriate as you thought. Bring in others and start this process over. Continue to bring in others as others drop out. It could be that you have many, many fund sources. The more you have, again, the more complicated, but it may be required depending on how complicated the program is that you're required or wanting to do, or the number of clients you may be wanting to serve. Make sure that you're understanding other eligibility issues for funding streams. What are the parameters by which you really need to be assuring that the right people are coming into the project? We call it through the front door.

How are you going to know that? I want to share with you some parts that have been developed that really might help you. This template A is analyzing your funding streams. I've just made up a scenario just so you guys can sort of think about how to block work through this. State X is one of the approximately so many states who still use, while have high rates of truancy, and they use the valid court order exception so that kids are being placed in detention for failing to go to school after a judge has issued a court order. That's not necessarily a positive thing. State X also has identified that juveniles who are low level risk for criminal offending, but high needs, so mental health, substance abuse, education, et cetera, are entering the juvenile justice system to receive services. I think all of you probably have that. It's like, they're not available on the outside, so just file on and call the cops, bring them and then systems will provide the services.

We also know that truant behavior behind it is strongly associated with child abuse and neglect and poverty and family disorganization and trauma. Those kids eventually, again, like the previous thing had said, these kids are ending up in court. Then they also found that truancy detention contributes to the higher likelihood of kids committing subsequent criminal offenses. These kids, graduating from high school is 14.5 times less for kids who end up in detention because of truancy. We also found, and I guess you can tell this is real data, and then also that kids were not graduating at near the rate that typical children, the general population were graduating. Wanting to really bring together, obviously these kids are really complex. They have so many issues, poverty, child abuse and neglect, mental health, substance abuse. There's a lot of services that these kids would need. What you're doing is you're bringing ... Let's say we've identified four different potential streams. We have JAG, we have Medicaid and EPSDT, AmeriCorps, don't really look at AmeriCorps, and then Grant X.

What you do is you start with who are we going to serve? There are a bunch of different ways that you want to look at it. We're talking about, we want to serve kids who are truant, who've not been involved with quite yet, kids who are truant who aren't involved with court, children who the teachers are concerned about, and children whom the parents are requesting services. Who can help serve these kids? Well, on this one, JAG is great and AmeriCorps is great. They would all meet and serve. Grant X though, they have some preconditions that disallow all, but the kids who were filed on in the court. Medicaid, only if they qualify for Medicaid. One of the things I'd be looking at is, what's the prevalence in terms of the need or the fact that our families might be Medicaid eligible. Then you go into other expected child and youth or family concerns that are going to be a part of it that you think services need to be provided for.

We have low income, history of foster care, mental health and substance abuse of the kids, and then mental health and substance abuse of the parents or guardians, health issues, and then risk of becoming homeless. Those are all things that we know are in the background that these kids are struggling with. Again, looking through the lens of each fund source, JAG looks great. Then on Medicaid, there are some things that aren't going to be necessarily approved. Again, some of this may be incorrect. I'm citing it as an example. AmeriCorps, they don't give funding, they provide people. When you say, yes, it's that that person is able to help you address those issues. Then Grant X is not so great on meeting many of those conditions. Then we go to the next page and the services and interventions that you want to have as a part of your program. You need to have screening. Is that something that could be reimbursed? You want to have an assessment of need. You want to have multidisciplinary staffings. You want to have plans developed and case management provided. You want parents and guardians have counseling, as well as the youth.

You want rental assistance. Again, going through each of the themes, again, a lot of it would be available through Medicaid if they are medically necessary and they are Medicaid eligible. AmeriCorps, sorry, is starting to not look so great. Now when you get to Grant X, if you do end up using it, it's looking pretty good in terms of its services, but you'd need to make sure you have an assessment that's evidence-based. There is a cap on the rental assistance of six months when you are actually planning and hoping to provide 12 months. That's something to consider. Then you go on to the next, again, a list of things that would be a part of your program. As you go through it and then at the back or the last one is, where are we delivering the services? If you want to do it where the kids are, it may be a courtroom, you may need to have them come to an office. You may need to do it at the school. Who will deliver the services?

Here, one of the things that you really might want to put on your list of to-do's is, when you have these lists of people, are there conditions in terms of the level of education or a license or anything like that that are preconditions for any of these funds sources? I would say Medicaid, if you're using them or substance abuse and mental health treatment funding that comes to your state, they will have

things like that. You always want to be aware of that so that you can accommodate that within your model. Then, I'm sorry, this is the last slide chart. This one is, what will your services accomplish? This is where you would put it in, you want to see improved attendance and grades. You want to see a decrease in court filings and an increase in housing stability by the number of days going down that they're actually homeless. Then in each of these, what measures? Are there any measures that they are already being asked that these funds sources would say, "You need to measure these by this way."

See where there is agreement on how you would measure them so that you're not having a three page document of outcomes that you're having to track. Then you always want to look at the timeframe for each of the funds systems, because some may be so short that it would be a hardship. Some of them have a lot more flexibility and would be easier to work with. These are really important for you to go through. Again, I went through them really quickly, but it almost gives you a visual way of saying, "I'm seeing a lot more Xs under one column than another. I'm seeing a lot more discreet information required that it's a yes, but under, let's say Grant X. Can we accommodate those yes spots? That's something that's really important to take a look at. What I really want you to really think about is analyzing your funding streams and identifying those funding gaps will allow you to determine which funding streams are appropriate. It's really important for you to understand that this is the beginning of the process.

The beginning of saying, "This is what we want to do. This is what we want to accomplish. These are the outcomes we want our families or the clients to have, and these are the systems or the agencies and the fund sources that really could help us with this." Then you are beginning to map out and you'll be able to really, assuming that you have the right partners and you have the funding at the table, then the next steps are to build your program. There's many steps that you would do with that. I really believe that many of you are saying this is very similar to what we do in many ways. I think it's really important for you to understand it's not unheard of, it's not impossible, and I want you to know that you can do this. When you develop the actual financing plan, obviously you need to have a program budget, a cost allocation. What we're talking about there is, what can grant X pay for versus grant Y?

We want to make sure that we are very clear that these funds or this service potentially it comes from here. Front door and back door protocols. The front door is basically, how do we make sure that we're getting in the clients that we intended to? How are we bringing them in so that we're not taking clients that really are inappropriate for our services and what we're intending to do? That's your screening and your assessment. The backdoor protocols really are the seamless kind of things that the clients will never see, is how do we make sure that when we are paying those agencies who provided staff to provide a service, that we're paying them from the appropriate grant funds so that you are not using funds in an inappropriate way? You have establish really clear criteria for bringing them in the door in the first place, making sure the services are available and provided, and then spreading those services to the right fund source. That obviously means tracking and reporting is really important. You want to have a financial system that is second to none, and you want ... I'll get to that.

You want to be able to have a nice easy ... I know that that may not be a possible way of contracting. Sometimes it's laborious, but try, because generally you will find that you need to do some contracting. Then quality control and staff training. When it comes to the training or it comes to the financial staff, you want someone leading that financial process who is really attentive to details and really is good about being able to dot the i's and cross the t's. You want a strong agency who has that really under their belt well. Next slide. Phase five, basically here is, you're going to implement, you're going to track and you're going to improve, so constant communication. Once you have your program design done and you get your funding all in order, I think it's vital that you come together. I would say minimally, I would just say quarterly at a certain level, make sure that you're on track, you're looking at

your spending, you're looking at the clients that you're bringing in. Are you ahead? Are you serving more than anticipated or less by this point in time?

I would say six months to a year, you want your high level folks to come in. Unless there are things that you need to address that have come up in your prior meetings. You definitely need to do an annual review of your financing plan. Because what you may find is that you anticipated being able to use a fund a lot more than it's actually being used. Well, is there a reason for that? Are we misunderstanding what ... Maybe there are services that should have been placed against that grant, but we didn't for some reason and we need to correct that. Or our clients aren't coming in with the conditions required necessarily to access that fund. Your plan is going to change. You're going to learn a lot as you implement as we well know. You've got to update the plan as it is necessary and you really do want to assess the value of this process, and assess the value to the potential clients that you're serving and really looking at outcomes. Sometimes outcomes are not seen in a year. Obviously it may take longer.

You're looking at the value of the program in a way that may not be holistic in the long run, but you're trying to make sure that we are moving in a way that will get us or it looks like we are getting to what we were trying to do in the beginning. Again, identify your vision and your partners. Define your program as well as you can and be willing to modify as necessary as you go. Explore your financing options and really take a look at what's available out there. Develop your coordinated financing plan. I would say, not just that, but also your service provision and the whole model. Then implement, track and improve. That is exactly what many of the federal agencies that have been doing this have been able to do, so I know it's possible. I think we'll find that you can be much more successful with a model like this.

Simone Greene:

Thank you. All right. Well, now we want to open it up for questions. If you have any questions, we can do this one of two ways. You can submit your question via the Q&A function, or you can raise your hand and I can unmute you to allow you to verbally ask your question. If you don't have any questions that are jumping out at all of you now, we do have a few things to note before we say goodbye. Meg, do you want to jump in with those while we wait for anyone to ask any questions?

Meg Williams:

I do want to clarify something on the ... Remember the example that we had to clarify, it might not be supplanting. The one thing I want to say is, this was the example with the communications duties placed on an officer who was already working 40 hours. We said, well if he added duties. I would say if he added duties and added hours. If he's being paid 100% for the 40 hour job, he had an advance and they just put communication duties on him and used that money but didn't decrease the amount of funds, then that could be supplanting because then you're ... I don't know how best to say it. But if his or hers hours are extended beyond 40 hours to accommodate the 10 hours for the communication details that he or she will be doing and using a different fund for that, that would not be supplanting. I just want to make sure that we're always clear on that.

I would say that talk with other people when you get into these if it's really unclear so that you can see what's going on and what might happen.

Simone Greene:

Thank you for clarifying that. I want to sort of pose the question. In the beginning, we know that there are multiple different types of collaborative funding models. We spoke on the differences between

braided funding versus blended funding. Is there a time where it's appropriate to blend funding as opposed to braiding?

Meg Williams:

I would love to hear if anybody has done that. If you would not do that, definitely don't do that with the federal funds unless you have explicit approval from your federal agency. I think that there are federal agencies who have approved that, believe it or not. It usually will be indicated in statute. It's going to be very rare, only because I think there's the need to be able to report back to Congress on exactly what that particular fund was able to accomplish won't be possible as clearly anyway when you're blending funding. It's a very rare, and they only justify it in very few instances. I think that, to be quite honest, I know blending would provide an easier way to do the bookkeeping, et cetera. But you can still get some of the benefits of having collaborations like you would get under blending, but using a braiding model. I think what it does is it just makes you really develop a great deal, more of tracking and assuring that funds are being spent appropriately and you're meeting all those criteria.

Although it's not as often and actually pretty rare anyway with governmental funds, you really need to think that you can get what you would be getting from blending by doing a braiding model. The other thing I wanted to clarify, I don't know if any of you have checked with your state statutes or your fiscal team members, is there any prohibition in your state for blending funding? I think that that's the other thing, you always want to make sure that it's not just the federal government that may have a problem when you start looking like you're blending and braiding, but what does your state say about it and how will you be able to show them that you're not blending funding but braiding? I think it'll be important to take that into consideration as well. Especially if you're bringing state funds from different agencies to the table, funding that you're not as familiar with. Go through the same process of looking back and saying, "What's this money intended for? Are there any clear guidelines about what we can fund and who can be a part of it?"

Give that the same due diligence that you would give to any federal fund that you'd be considering.

Simone Greene:

Thank you. That's a great point. Before we pivot to next steps and closing out this webinar, I wanted to open it up before we move on to see if ... Our initial question about people's experience levels with braided funding, about a third of you said that you do have experience with braided funding. I just wanted to open up the question to the class to see if you have had success with using a braided funding model and if you wanted to share that. All right. If not, I just wanted to highlight some next steps. Just be on the lookout for other training opportunities from NCJA. I'll touch upon one training opportunity that's coming up on the next slide. I mentioned at the beginning that in the learning management system that you used to sign on we created a braided funding guide that compliments this training. Feel free to give that a look and we will also be sending that out as a followup.

Then if you have more questions, you are super interested in developing a braided funding model and you're just trying to figure out where to get started, we do offer technical assistance. Really, really feel free to reach out to us at strategicplanning@ncja.com. I will also have that email address on the last slide in your follow-up email. I also wanted to let you all know that we do have a grants management training that NCJA is hosting next week on the 15th and the 16th. It's a virtual training that will include presentations from the Department of Justice's JustGrants team, programmatic updates, and a conversation with BJA leadership and an interactive session about PMT. There'll be breakout sessions and question and answer sessions. If you really, really want to dig deeper into grants

management, this is the training for you. The cost is \$165. If you're not already registered, you can find the registration information on the events page of the NCJA websites.

Again, I want to thank everyone for being here. I want to thank Meg for being an amazing speaker today. If you have any technical assistance needs related to braided funding or to strategic planning as a whole, feel free to reach out to us at strategicplanning@ncja.org. Finally, please fill out the evaluation that will pop up once you close out of this webinar, and also you'll get the link in your follow-up email. Let us know how we did or any feedback or anything that you really like. We love all feedback. Again, take care of everyone and thank you for being here.

Meg Williams:

Bye. Thank you.