

Grant Proposal / Community Policing Development Application Packet

Executive Summary

Community policing is ultimately a crime-fighting strategy. Yet the lack of a widely accepted community policing implementation framework may be hampering the effectiveness not only of community policing itself, but of law enforcement generally. [Applicant], a private consulting firm led by a community policing advocate, former deputy chief of police and international crisis management expert for the FBI, proposes to develop an implementation stage framework and a self-assessment instrument that operationalizes community policing. [Applicant] will engage all sectors of the communities and a wide range of agency representatives in 15 American cities through a careful process of site visit interviews. The draft framework will then be validated and serve as the blueprint for a self assessment tool that determines an agency's current community policing implementation status. The tool will also guide agencies as they strategize, plan, and train for full implementation. This assessment tool fills in the current gap in community policing implementation, advancing the philosophy by providing a roadmap through the maze of current efforts. All agencies considering or currently implementing community policing are the target audience and will ultimately be served by utilizing the assessment tool.

Project Need

The COPS Office has fostered collaborative problem-solving between police, community and faith-based agencies and schools, and the community at large, helping them to develop and implement organizational plans that support the adoption and maintenance of community policing. COPS created a national network of Regional Community Policing Institutes to promote community policing training, and has produced numerous publications on community policing. COPS has provided funding for hiring 118,000 community policing officers across the United States.

The field of community policing is bustling with activity. Yet a specific public safety need remains: there is no universally accepted approach for implementing community policing. In the absence of a framework, several workable definitions for community policing and several practical models for its application have emerged throughout the country. While each model of application has its strengths, it also has weaknesses. Since community policing is ultimately a crime-fighting strategy, this state of flux and uncertainty may actually be reducing the effectiveness of community policing as a whole and affecting public confidence in the philosophy itself.

For example, when an agency decides to implement community policing, it must choose from several possible approaches, none of which is completely comprehensive. Planning for the transition of an agency toward community policing is a complex and difficult endeavor; implementing the transition is even more challenging. The agency may succeed in some areas, but not in others. When the program can show only moderate or limited success, the criticisms

of those who were initially opposed to the change seem legitimate, and the entire program may be at risk.

There is a need to bring the various effective elements of community policing together under one widely acknowledged rubric, so that agencies who decide to make the transition to community policing have a step-by-step process to follow that is nationally accepted and validated. The support of the COPS Office for this project is fundamental: it gives entree into agencies that might otherwise be reluctant to participate. While law enforcement agencies have the requisite background, most would have to divert resources and personnel to take on such a major project. [Applicant], as a private company, has both the expertise and personnel available to devote to this crucial project, contingent on Federal funds.

Project Goal

The development of an implementation stage framework and a self-assessment instrument that operationalizes community policing and assists agencies in measuring and evaluating their implementation of community policing elements.

Project Objectives

1. Identify the major elements and sub-elements, and all the specific activities that comprise them, that capture the commonly accepted principles of community policing, using a combination of existing research and input from community and practitioners.

Measure: A representative sample of 18-19 practitioners and academics in the field accepts that all appropriate elements are incorporated and fully addressed in the element list

2. Develop an operationalized implementation stage framework reflecting concrete and realistic examples of the key elements of community policing as they are applied in the field.

Measure: Completed framework flow chart with at least 2 concrete examples for each element

3. Develop a self-assessment tool, informed by the operationalized implementation stage framework, to be used by law enforcement agencies for measuring implementation of the full spectrum of community policing that
 - a. facilitates executives and officers in determining their agency's current implementation status
 - b. facilitates internal goal planning toward complete implementation
 - c. informs training and management initiatives toward the full adoption of the community policing philosophy

Measure: Completed self assessment instrument focused on the above elements

4. Test and validate the self-assessment tool in the maximum number of police agencies supported by the budget.

Measure: A representative sample of 18-19 practitioners and academics in the field accepts that the self-assessment tool is an accurate measure and reflection of an agency's current implementation status

5. Develop a practical user's guide based on the validation process, incorporating lessons, recommendations and anticipated considerations.

Measure: Representative sample of practitioners and academics in the field accepts that the manual is a valid guide for applying the assessment tool

6. Assure framework compatibility with an accompanying suite of resources that allows for follow-up based on the self-assessment results.

Measure: COPS acknowledgement of compatibility with resources

7. Develop proposals for a Phase 2 of the project to include a software version of the self-assessment and a guide for full implementation of the stage framework.

Measure: Completed Phase 2 Proposals

Detailed Project Description

Framework Development Project Implementation Plan

[Applicant] intends to start with the commonly accepted elements of community policing identified by COPS - *tactical problem solving, organizational change strategies, and community engagement and partnership* - and build a step-by-step framework for implementing community policing. The construction of this framework will start with a literature search, followed by strategic interviews designed to identify problems and solutions to community policing implementation in a range of targeted cities.

While hundreds of participants will assist in developing the framework, at least one person from each city will be asked to serve on the validation team, in addition to 3-4 well-known community policing experts from the academic field, at least two of whom will be published authors. The COPS Office will be asked to review the validation team.

1. Number of participating agencies (cities): 15

2. Number of individual agency participants in each city: minimum of 5
3. Selection process – Identify participating agencies that represent a wide range of geography, population size, ethnic diversity, stages of concept implementation, relationship with COPS. Personal knowledge of communities will also be considered. Anticipated participant agencies include Los Angeles PD, Seattle PD, Sioux City PD, , Huntsville PD, Ft. Lauderdale PD, and Austin PD. After considering all of these elements, it was determined that at least 15 sites were needed in order to achieve a valid representation.
4. Sample agency interview questions: “What problems or roadblocks did you encounter trying to implement strategy X?” “What steps did you take to address or overcome the problem?” “If you were to start over, what additional steps would you take?”

Community Involvement

Community participation is fundamental to any assessment of community policing. All sectors of each community will be involved, including business, homeowner, crime watch, activist, faith-based agencies, etc. In addition to personally identified community contacts, significant attention will be given to identifying legitimate representatives of the participating communities, including advance contact with national organizations such as the NAACP and LULAC to determine local chapter strength. Community affairs representatives within each city’s agency will also be asked to identify local community members with their fingers on the pulse of the community. Translators will be secured in all cities with significant limited English proficiency communities. Strategies for involving community members in each city will be customized, depending on that community’s participation culture. For example, some agencies may have positive enough relationships with community members to host a successful invite-meeting. In

other locations, it may be necessary to hold meetings in neighborhood centers or secure an invitation to community group meetings.

1. Number of individual community participants within each city: Minimum of 20
2. Sample community interview questions: “What could the department do to make community policing work better?” “What could the community do to make community policing work better?” “Have all stakeholders been identified and included in the planning process?” Where has the department gotten ahead of itself in trying to implement community policing?” “What initiatives can be taken to include and involve the community?”

Specific Activity	Timeline
Begin work immediately upon selection	Month 1
Complete internet and library literature search to develop baseline for key elements	Month 1
Finalize list of participating agencies, and academic validation participants	Months 1-2
Research vital community representatives for each city	Months 1-2
Letters of introduction, arrange initial visits to agencies	Month 2
Conduct framework development interviews with community and agency representatives	Months 2-5
Use a nomination process to select at least one person from each city to serve on validation team, in addition to 3-4 academic experts	Months 2-5
Complete implementation stage framework	Months 6-7

Forward framework to validation team and secure acceptance, making adjustments as recommended	Month 8
---	---------

Assessment Development Implementation Plan

[Applicant] will develop the agency self assessment tool using academic research, professional experience and input from the participating agencies. Self assessment tool questions will directly mirror the implementation stage framework. The assessment tool will take the shape of a flow-chart, so that each answer will direct the assessor to the next relevant question. For example, if the answer is yes, go to A, if the answer is no, go to B.

Agencies will be encouraged to distribute multiple copies of the paper assessment tool to all levels of department personnel as well as community members. Completed assessments can be tabulated internally or submitted to [Applicant] for tabulation, evaluation and recommendations. Individual assessments will be tabulated to result in one overall resulting status report, as described in the user’s manual.

Conduct literature search for assessment tool background	Months 9-10
Develop assessment tool based on research and implementation stage framework	Months 11-12

Assessment Validation Implementation Plan

Validation of the assessment tool will take two phases. The first phase will include one participating agency and two that did not participate in the framework development.

[Applicant] will assist in the assessment on site. Input and insights from this test process will be used to adjust the assessment tool. Phase two participants – the balance of participating agencies and five who did not participate in the framework development, will be asked to complete the assessment without assistance, other than the accompanying manual. Selection criteria for the non-participating agencies will be the same as that for participating agencies.

[Applicant] will solicit feedback through follow-up telephone reviews. A summary that reports on all stages of the assessment process will be prepared and sent to the validation team. Any adjustments recommended by the validation team will be resent again to the team for final approval. Upon final validation, the framework, assessment tool, and manual will be submitted to the COPS Office.

1. Number of validating agencies: 22
2. Number of individuals in validation team: 18-19

Specific Activity	Timeline
Visit 3 beta test sites to oversee assessment – 1 participating agency and 2 non-participating agencies	Month 13
Make adjustments to assessment based on test applications	Month 14
Develop assessment tool user manual	Month 15
Mail assessments and manuals to the balance of participating agencies, as well as 5 non-participating agencies	Month 16

Receive completed assessments and evaluate success	Month 17
Follow up with telephone reviews with each assessing agency	Month 17
Make adjustments to assessment and manual based on the feedback received	Month 18
Forward tabulated assessments, adjusted assessment tool, manual, and report to validation team	Month 18
Receive responses from validation team, make adjustments as necessary, (if necessary) resubmit final copy and receive final validation	Month 19-20
Submit validated implementation stage framework, assessment tool and manual to COPS Office	Month 20

Qualifications

LS, President of [Applicant], LLC, and the program manager for this proposal, has experience in developing and implementing processes similar to those required in the Community Policing Development Proposal. Mr. S's tenure with the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) included numerous assignments within the scope of federal investigations. He conducted extensive research in crisis negotiations and crisis management and served nationally and internationally as a primary negotiator in numerous real-time hostage, barricade and kidnapping situations. Mr. S was responsible for the development of the Law Enforcement Negotiation Support/Hostage Barricade System (LENS/HOBAS) and directed this project from its inception through implementation. The interactive, computer-based software program and accompanying program manual and training documents were developed for the U.S. Department of Justice and

the FBI, and the system is used today in international and domestic law enforcement agencies. LENS/HOBAS allows users to collect on-site data relating to hostage/barricade/suicide incidents, to develop negotiation strategies for dealing with incidents and individual subjects and to record notes relating to the unfolding of an incident. The success of the LENS/HOBAS project can be replicated in the development of an assessment tool for the implementation of community oriented policing.

As the former Deputy Police Chief in Huntsville, Alabama, LS ran the daily operations of a police force of more than 600 with an annual budget of \$27 million. He led the agency in the development and implementation of community-based police model from a centralized model in that city. Not only does he have theoretical knowledge of community policing models and methodologies, but he has experience with the practical application of the concept. Mr. S developed liaisons with federal, state and municipal authorities to provide programming and funding for community-related projects. He managed multiple police/community joint ventures that focused on positive community relations with the police department such as Crime Stoppers, Community Watch, Citizen Ride-Along Program and the Senior Citizen Police Academy. He also managed a number of federal grants for the department that included, but was not limited to, the "Weed and Seed" program to reduce crime in high crime areas by concentrating police efforts in target areas; as well as D.A.R.E. (Drug Awareness Reduction Education), which placed specially trained officers in schools; and technology grants to place computers in patrol cars.

LS began his career in law enforcement over 30 years ago as a police officer in Englewood, New Jersey, rising to the rank of detective and, after eight years, joined the Federal Bureau of

Investigation. He trained FBI agents in the FBI Academy in Quantico, Virginia and taught crisis negotiations and crisis management to senior police officers from around the country at the FBI's National Academy and the Executive Development Institute. Because of his expertise Mr. S served as a member of multiple advisory groups on behalf of the U.S. Departments of Justice and State and provided in-depth assistance and direction to numerous foreign governments on issues and policies of crisis management, threat assessment, crisis negotiation, kidnapping and extortion. Prior to his retirement from the FBI after 21 years of service, he was the Unit Chief of the National Domestic Preparedness Office at FBI Headquarters in Washington, D.C., a precursor to Homeland Security. In that capacity he developed policy for the national response to a threat of weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. S continued his law enforcement career by accepting the position of Deputy Chief in Huntsville, Alabama. There he was responsible for the daily operations of the department and was instrumental in coordinating local, regional and federal resources to enhance the department's efforts to reduce crime and increase public safety.

Throughout his distinguished career, Mr. S has developed the requisite research capabilities to approach an observable need and devise a working solution. As an instructor in the FBI he researched education modules and developed curricula and instruction modules for in-service training, law enforcement road schools for veteran FBI field agents and police officers, and classes at the FBI National Academy. Mr. Schenck has also done extensive research in critical areas of law enforcement and has acted as an advisor to foreign governments.

The key project staff and consultants have collectively approximately 88 years of experience working with law enforcement and/or community oriented police models. Their resumes are included.

A request has been made, and we anticipate receiving a letter of support from United States Senator Richard Shelby.

Management plan

Since the primary responsibility for this project rests with one person, management of personnel will be streamlined. [Applicant] President, LS, will manage the project, and oversee two consultants, working closely in tandem with them. After receiving an orientation on the grant and project, the consultants will be responsible for three to four site visits each. Consultants will provide weekly updates on all activities, and will receive quarterly performance evaluations from Mr. S.

Grant management

Grant management will be conducted primarily by MS, who will maintain all records, manage the timeline, scheduling, follow-up and all other duties associated with grant monitoring. She will submit quarterly accountability reports to the COPS Office online. All federal grant funds will be kept in a dedicated account, expenses carefully documented, and receipts maintained in a file.

Next Steps

Following the conclusion of Federal support, [Applicant] will offer affordable advisory and evaluative services to agencies interested in assistance with the assessment tool. [Applicant] anticipates a Phase 2 of the project that will focus, with COPS Office support and concurrence, on development of a software version of the assessment tool, as well as a consultative guide toward full implementation of the community policing stage framework.

V. Budget

Budget narrative

The budget for this 20-month project totals \$299,934. The project involves two salaried employees – the program manager and an administrative assistant - and three consultants to ensure a careful and complete interview process with both agency and community representatives. One consultant will also provide analysis and validation assistance. A detailed accounting of fringe benefits is provided. Aside from personnel, the other major expense is just over \$9,000 for travel to 15 cities for the interview phase and 3 cities for the test phase. Portable computer equipment is requested to aid in the documentation of the interviews and testing. Other costs include translators, printing of the assessment tool, meeting expenses, and stipends for community participants. Indirect costs are not requested. The entire project budget is completely separate from the agency's standard operating budget.

Budget Detail Worksheet

Organization Name and State: [Applicant], LLC; Florida

A. Personnel

List each requested position by title, if available. Show the annual salary rate and the percentage of time to be devoted to the project. Compensation paid for employees engaged in grant activities must be consistent with that paid for similar work within the applicant's organization.

<u>Name/Title</u>	<u>Computation</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Cost (20 months)</u>
LS/Program Manager	\$6,500/mo	100%	\$130,000
Administrative Assistant III	\$3,000/mo	100%	\$ 60,000
		TOTAL:	\$190,000

Source: Salary.com

C. Travel, cont.

Site Visits/Beta Testing	3 cities in US	Airfare	\$568RTx3trips	\$1,704
		Lodging	\$100x4nightsx3 trips	\$1,200
		Meals	\$50x4daysx3 trips	\$ 600
		Car Rental	\$52.50x4daysx3 trips	\$ 636
		Gas	\$50x3 trips	\$ 150
		Mileage	RTx3trips	\$ 150
		to/from Airport		
		Parking	\$10x5daysx3 trips	\$ 150
			TOTAL	\$27,510

D. Equipment

List requested nonexpendable equipment. Nonexpendable equipment is tangible property having a useful life of more than two years and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more per unit. Expendable items should be included either in the “Supplies” category or in the “Other” category. Applicants should analyze the cost benefits of purchasing versus leasing equipment, especially high-cost items and those subject to rapid technical advances. Rented or leased equipment should be listed in the “Contractual” category.

N/A

E. Supplies

List requested items by type (office supplies, postage, and expendable equipment items costing less than \$5,000, such as books, hand-held recorders, etc.) and show the basis for computation. Generally, supplies may include any materials that are expendable or consumed during the course of the project.

<u>Supply Items</u>	<u>Computation</u>	<u>Cost</u>
Lap Top	market price	\$2,500
Software		\$ 800
Storage Media		\$ 100
Laser Printer		\$ 399
Ink Cartridges		\$ 160
Digital Voice Recorder		\$ 100
Postage		\$ 700
Books/Publications		\$ 500
Office Supplies		\$ 750
	TOTAL	\$6,009

F. Consultants / Contracts

Consultant Fees: For each requested consultant enter the name, if known; service to be provided; hourly or daily fee (8-hour day); and estimated time on the project. Consultant fees in excess of \$450 per day require additional justification. (Please contact the COPS Office for further guidance.)

<u>Name of Consultant</u>	<u>Service Provided</u>	<u>Computation</u>	<u>Cost</u>
WP	Data collection/interview	\$450x4 daysx3 trips	\$1,350
BS	Data collection/interview	\$450x4 daysx3 trips	\$1,350
WK	Analysis/validation	\$450x4 daysx3 trips	\$1,350
<i>Subtotal:</i>			\$4,050

Consultant Expenses: List all requested expenses to be paid from the grant to each individual consultant in addition to his/her fees (e.g., travel, meals, lodging).

<u>Purpose of Travel</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Computation</u>	<u>Cost</u>
Site Visits/2 Consultants	3 cities in US	Airfare	\$568RTx3trips	\$1,704
		Lodging	\$100x4nightsx3 trips	\$1,200
		Meals	\$50x4daysx3 trips	\$ 600
		Car Rental	\$52.50x4daysx3 trips	\$ 636
		Gas	\$50x3 trips	\$ 150
		Mileage	RTx3trips	\$ 150
		to/from Airport		
		Parking	\$10x5daysx3 trips	\$ 150
<i>Subtotal:</i>			\$9,192	

Contracts: Provide a description of the product or service to be procured by contract and an estimate of the cost. Applicants are encouraged to promote free and open competition in awarding contracts. A separate justification must be provided for sole-source contracts in excess of \$100,000. (Please contact the COPS Office for further guidance.)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Cost</u>
<i>Subtotal:</i> \$	N/A
Total:	\$13,242

G. Indirect Costs

If indirect costs are requested, a copy of the agency's fully-executed, negotiated Federal Rate Approval Agreement must be attached.

N/A

H. Other Cost

List other requested items that will support project goals and objectives.

Description	Computation	Cost
Printing Services for Self-Assessment Tool, Interview Questions		\$ 675
Translators	\$75/hrx4hrsx5sites	\$1,500
Lunch/Dinner Meetings with Focus Group		\$2,000
Hotel Meeting Rooms		\$ 800
Internet Service	\$20/mox20mos	\$ 400
Stipends for Interview Participants		\$2,000
	TOTAL	\$7,375

Budget Summary

When you have completed the Budget Detail Worksheet, transfer the totals for each category to the spaces below.

Budget Category	Amount
A. Personnel	\$190,000
B. Fringe Benefits	\$ 55,798
C. Travel	\$ 27,510
D. Equipment	\$ N/A
E. Supplies	\$ 6,009
F. Consultants/Contracts	\$ 13,242
G. Indirect Costs	\$ N/A
H. Other Costs	\$ 7,375
Total Project Costs	\$299,934