

LAW ENFORCEMENT GRANTS
A COMPARISON OF FUNDED
GRANT AWARDS

by

KENNETH ANDREW MYERS

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
The University of Texas at Arlington in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS IN CRIMINOLOGY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON

December 2006

Copyright © by Kenneth Andrew Myers, 2006

All Rights Reserved

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The process of obtaining a Master's Degree in Criminology and Criminal Justice is demanding of not only the student, but also the student's family. Many hours were spent in classrooms, at the library conducting research and in my home office authoring research papers and preparing for the next class assignment. The time spent on obtaining my degree was time spent away from my family. I truly appreciate the sacrifices made by my wife, Franci, and our child, Aaron. My wife constantly offered inspiration through her words and actions. Simple hugs were provided for no reason, but always at the right time. I can only hope and encourage my son Aaron to surpass me in the level of education he may obtain. I hope to always serve as an aspiration to my son.

I also want to recognize several other individuals and organizations that encouraged me. My parents served not only as role models, but proofread numerous papers and provided constant support. The Allen Police Department administration allowed me the opportunity to better myself both professionally and academically by providing mentorship and flexibility. The United States Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, provided me a timely response to open records requests and assisted me in providing instruction manuals for the grants. Lastly, I want to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. Alejandro del Carmen who has served as an academic mentor to me. Without his passion for education and his desire to see each of

his students succeed, my journey through higher education would have been much more difficult.

Without each of these individuals and organizations, my goal of obtaining a master's degree would have been unreachable.

November 2, 2006

ABSTRACT

LAW ENFORCEMENT GRANTS

A MODEL TO SUCCESSFUL

GRANT WRITING

Publication No. _____

Kenneth Andrew Myers, MA

The University of Texas at Arlington, 2006

Supervising Professor: Dr. Alejandro del Carmen

The purpose of the study is to identify commonalities among federal grants that have been awarded by the United States Department of Justice – Community Oriented Policing Services Office and the Department of Homeland Security. The research focuses on 48 grants that were awarded from five grant areas inclusive of personnel grants and equipment grants. A measurement instrument was developed to extract data from the grants for the purpose of determining if patterns existed among the awarded grants. The grants chosen came from jurisdictions of all types, sizes and demographics and represent a cross-section of American law enforcement. Once the data were collected, it was analyzed and examined for patterns. The data are presented in a

manner that allows the reader to determine if the information presented can be used as a model to assist them in the development of their own grant applications.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
ABSTRACT	v
LIST OF TABLES	ix
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Community Oriented Policing	2
1.2 Homeland Security.....	2
1.3 Types of Grants.....	3
1.4 Terminology.....	4
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	12
2.1 History of Community Oriented Policing	12
2.2 Community Oriented Policing Studies Funded By Grants	17
2.3 The Office of Community Oriented Policing Services	19
2.3.1 Timeline of the Office of Community Oriented Police Services.....	21
2.4 Homeland Security Initiatives	24
2.5 The Department of Homeland Security.....	27
2.6 Grant Funding Pre & Post 9/11	30
2.6.1 Personnel Grants	32
2.6.2 Equipment Grants	37

2.6.3 Tribal Resource Grant Program Grants	39
2.7 Special Program Grants	41
2.8 Homeland Security Initiatives	43
2.9 Citizen Corps Grants.....	49
2.10 Alternative Funding Sources.....	52
3. METHODOLOGY.....	57
3.1 Federal Grants Reviewed	63
4. FINDINGS.....	64
4.1 Grant Analysis – All Grants	64
4.2 Grant Analysis – By Size of Jurisdiction	68
4.3 Grant Analysis – Additional Findings	71
5. CONCLUSION.....	72
Appendix	
A. FEDERAL GRANT INSTRUMENT	80
REFERENCES	82
BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION.....	86

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
4.1 Grants By Type And Size of Jurisdiction.....	64
4.2 Keywords / Action Frequency.....	66
4.3 Use of Philosophies.....	67
4.4 Frequency of Terms – All Grants.....	68
4.5 Average of All Grants.....	69
4.6 Average of Personnel Grants.....	69
4.7 Average of Equipment Grants.....	69
4.8 Frequency of Terms - Small Jurisdictions.....	70
4.9 Frequency of Terms - Medium Jurisdictions.....	70
4.10 Frequency of Terms - Large Jurisdictions.....	70

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Millions of dollars every year may be lost by law enforcement agencies that are ill-equipped and lack the personnel, skills, knowledge, vocabulary, and understanding to prepare and submit grant applications for financial and equipment assistance from the United States government. This deficiency affects law enforcement agencies of all sizes and in all geographic regions of the country. During recent years, many jurisdictions and law enforcement agencies have experienced significant budget cuts. The loss of finances can result in decreases in the number of authorized sworn officers, delays in implementing technological programs, and prevention of any new programs such as school resource officers from being implemented. This decrease in funding, along with other reasons, has increased the number of agencies applying for grants. Logically, the more agencies that submit applications for grants, the more competitive the grant process becomes. This study examines 48 federal law enforcement grants from the United States Department of Homeland Security and United States Department of Justice – Community Oriented Policing Services Office. The grants that were reviewed and analyzed were submitted by jurisdictions of varying sizes, demographics, socioeconomics, and regions of the country. These law enforcement grants also vary by purpose in that some request funding for equipment, while others request funding for personnel. This study will examine the demographics of the requesting agency in

relationship to the amount requested and look for common word usage and frequency, use of key philosophies, and financial components of the grant.

1.1 Community Oriented Policing

Since the 1980's the terminology "Community Oriented Policing" has been a popular catch phrase among law enforcement agencies. This catch phrase was loosely used to describe how police departments interacted with the communities they served. The United States Department of Justice established the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS Office). The COPS Office has provided billions of dollars in grants to local, county, state, and tribal law enforcement agencies for a variety of projects including the supplemental hiring of police officers for Community Oriented Policing projects, the hiring of officers to serve in primary schools, implementation of new technologies to supplement the need for additional police officers, and for the hiring of civilian personnel so sworn officers could be reassigned from non-enforcement assignments to duties that require a licensed police officer. However, the events of September 11, 2001 changed this terminology.

1.2 Homeland Security

One can argue that since September 11, 2001, grant applications and grant writing has seen the use of a new term, "Homeland Security." The terrorist attacks of 9/11 may have forever changed law enforcement. Included in this change was a transition in the priorities grantors made in the types of grant awards made to jurisdictions. While grants once incorporated the quantity and quality of "Officer Friendly" type programs offered by a jurisdiction, new grant requirements are focused

more on strategic hardening of potential sites that could be attacked by terrorists. In an effort to explain the purpose of programs many grant writers use key terms such as Homeland Security and Community Oriented Policing to explain the purpose and direction of the proposed grant.

1.3 Types of Grants

Grants are also categorized by funding type. Generally, the two types of funding categories include personnel grants and equipment grants. As the categories indicate, personnel grants fund new positions. While most personnel grants fund new police officer positions, some selected personnel grants will fund non-sworn positions such as 9-1-1 dispatchers, records clerks, and victim advocates. Equipment grants are funds that are designated for the sole purpose of equipment acquisitions. These grants often request funding for upgrading technology (i.e. computers, software, and other equipment related to law enforcement). While the terminology and purpose of grants change to reflect recent events and priorities, the make-up and components of a grant often change from grant to grant.

The components of a grant are dependant on the whims of the grantor. Most, but not all, grants known by this researcher will contain a cover sheet, introduction, budget, problem statement, goal statement, project activities, an outcome/output section, and a conclusion or summary. These components assist the grantor in only receiving the information they require or need to meet the requirements of their grant. Grantors may also score grants by components to determine a total grant score. Competitive grants may only fund the most well written, purposeful grant.

Furthermore, it can be argued that no two grants are ever the same. Each grant, grantee and grantor has priorities, needs, and goals to accomplish. The successful grant combines the needs of each individual or group together with the purpose of funding successful programs to law enforcement agencies. It can be argued that law enforcement agencies do not apply for millions of grant dollars each year. It is hopeful that the research conducted will assist law enforcement agencies in any jurisdiction and of any size with the process of researching, applying for and successfully being awarded grants. Lastly, it is important for grant writers, educators, criminal justice practitioners and others reviewing this study to understand and accept the following terms.

1.4 Terminology

For the purposes of this study the following terms are defined:

Applicant – The entity requesting a grant.

Assurances – A variety of requirements, found in different Federal laws, regulations, and executive orders, which applicants agree in writing to observe as a condition of receiving federal assistance.

Authorized Representative / Official – The official within an applicant organization with the legal authority to give assurances, make commitments, enter into contracts, and execute such documents on behalf of the applicant as may be required by a grant maker. The signature of the Authorized Representative certifies that commitments made on grant proposals will be honored and ensures that the applicant agrees to conform to the grant maker's regulations, guidelines, and policies. Note that the Authorized Representative is not necessarily the

Project Director. The authorized officials are the individuals in the organization who have final authority and responsibility for all programmatic and financial decisions regarding this grant award. Project directors for a law enforcement agency are generally the chief law enforcement executive (Chief of Police, Sheriff, etc.) and the authorized representative for local governments are usually the Mayor, Presidents of Council, and / or County Commissioner for the jurisdiction.

Audit – A formal examination of an organization's or individual's accounts or financial situation. An audit may also include examination of compliance with applicable terms, laws, and regulations.

Certification – A statement, signed by an applicant or grantee as a prerequisite for receiving federal funds, that it meets or will adhere to certain conditions and/or will undertake or not undertake certain actions.

Competitive review process – Used by FNS to select discretionary grant applications for funding, in which applications are scored by subject-area experts and the highest scored applications are considered for funding.

Community Oriented Policing – A philosophy that promotes and supports organizational strategies to address the causes and reduce the fear of crime and social disorder. Agencies following community policing philosophies should implement or enhance policing strategies that illustrate community partnerships, problem solving, and organizational commitment to the community.

COPS Office – The Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) is the division of the U.S. Department of Justice that is the "grantor agency" for UHP grants. The COPS Office is responsible for assisting agencies with the administration and maintenance of its grant for the entire grant period.

Discretionary Grant – An award of financial assistance in the form of money by the federal government to an eligible grantee, usually made on the basis of a competitive review process.

DHS – United States Department of Homeland Security.

DUNS Number – A nine-digit number assigned to an organization by Dun & Bradstreet. The number does not convey any information about the recipient. A built-in check digit helps assure the accuracy of the DUNS Number. The ninth digit of each number is the check digit which is mathematically related to the other digits.

EEOP – Equal Employment Opportunity Plan.

Formula Grant – Funds provided to specified grantees on the basis of a specific formula prescribed in the legislation or regulation.

Funding Priorities – Means of focusing a grant competition on the areas in which the agency is particularly interested in receiving applications. Priorities can be absolute, which the applicant must address in order to be considered for funding; competitive, which the applicant has the option of choosing whether or not to address and for which they may receive additional points; or invitational,

which the applicant is encouraged but not required to address. Failure to address funding priorities may result in a grant application that is not funded.

Grant – A type of financial assistance awarded to an organization to conduct research or other programs as specified in an approved proposal. A grant, as opposed to a cooperative agreement, is used whenever the awarding office anticipates no substantial programmatic involvement with the recipient during the performance of the activities.

Grant Award Notification – An official document signed by the authorized official stating the amount and the terms and conditions of an award for a discretionary grant.

Grantee – An individual or organization that has been awarded financial assistance under one of the agency's grant programs.

Grantor – (also known as funder or funding agency) Any legal entity, public or private, that awards grants to school districts, individual schools, or bodies of government; grantors include local, state, or federal government agencies, private foundations, private or public non-profit organizations, and corporations.

Goal Statement – A broad, general statement about what will be accomplished by a project and how it will be done.

Homeland Security – A concerted national effort to prevent terrorist attacks within the United States, reduce America's vulnerability to terrorism, and minimize the damage and recover from attacks that do occur.

Interoperability – The ability of software and hardware on multiple machines from multiple vendors to communicate. Often referred to in terms of communication systems.

Matching Funds – A grant that requires a specified portion of the cost of a supported item of equipment or project be obtained from other sources. The required match may be more or less than the amount of the grant. Some matching grants require that the additional funds be obtained from sources outside the recipient organization. Many matching grants are paid in installments, the payments coinciding with the attainment of pre-specified levels of additional funding.

Pass-Through – States must give a percentage of the grant they receive to local governments, combination of local units, or other specified groups or organizations.

Problem Statement – Presents the reasons why the project has been designed. The problem should be supported by evidence drawn from experience, statistics provided by authoritative sources, and appropriate literature. This section should avoid the use of jargon and instead use "human" or lay terms and descriptions to present the problem.

Project Director – An individual designated by the grantee to be responsible for the administration of a project including project management, submission of all required documents, communication with the grantor and other appropriate agencies, and carrying out project activities.

Resolution – Authorization of the governing body to apply, accept, reject or alter a grant. Resolutions may be required of local units of government to apply for grant funds and/or incorporate those funds in the local budget.

Request for Proposal (RFP) – Announcements that specify a topic of research, methods to be used, and product(s) to be delivered. Proposals submitted in response to RFPs generally result in the award of a contract with terms and conditions which allow the sponsor a lot of control over how the project is conducted.

School Resource Officer (SRO) – The COPS statute defines an SRO as a career law enforcement officer, with sworn authority, deployed in Community Oriented Policing, assigned by the employing police department or agency to work in collaboration with schools and community-based organizations to:

- Address crime and disorder problems, gangs, and drug activities affecting or occurring in or around an elementary or secondary school;
- Develop or expand crime prevention efforts for students;
- Educate likely school-age victims in crime prevention and safety;
- Develop or expand community justice initiatives for students;
- Train students in conflict resolution, restorative justice, and crime awareness;
- Assist in the identification of physical changes in the environment that may reduce crime in or around the school; and
- Assist in developing school policies that address crime and recommend procedural changes.

Site Visit – A visit by the grantor to review the progress, determine if outputs and outcomes are met and / or audit the grantee.

Supplanting – For the purposes of a COPS grant, supplanting means replacing state or local funds that otherwise would have been spent on sworn officer positions with federal COPS funds. The awarded agency is prohibited from supplanting throughout the three-year grant period. This means that the agency may not use COPS funds to pay for any sworn officer positions (full-time, part-time, reserve or other) which, in the absence of the COPS program, would otherwise have been funded with state and/or local funds, or funds supplied by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. COPS funds must instead be used to supplement, or increase, the awarded law enforcement budget for sworn officer positions. As a general matter, in assessing the presence of supplanting, throughout the grant period the COPS Office expects an agency to hire new officers at a level consistent with recent historical practice and to take positive and timely steps to fill all vacancies in the sworn personnel resulting from attrition. The agency may not reduce its local, state or Bureau of Indian Affairs - funded sworn officer position(s) as a result of receiving a grant.

VOCA – Victims of Crime Act.

VAWA – Violence Against Women Act.

USDOJ – United States Department of Justice.

In Chapter 2 the reader will find a discussion of applicable literature regarding Community Oriented Policing and Homeland Security. Additionally, the literature

review will incorporate the history of COPS Grants and the priorities of the Department of Homeland Security.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of the study is to identify commonalities among federal grants that have been awarded by the United States Department of Justice – Community Oriented Policing Services Office and the Department of Homeland Security. The study developed a model that local, county and state law enforcement agencies can utilize when submitting federal, state and private foundation grants in a post 9/11 funding environment. The model will assist law enforcement in determining grant projects, identification of potential funding sources, definitions of commonly used grant terms, and authoring grant applications. The following section provides an overview of literature on this topic. The Literature Review informs the reader of the history of Community Oriented Policing, Homeland Security initiatives, grant funding pre and post 9/11, and the development of a model that will assist law enforcement agencies in successfully applying for grants that combine Community Oriented Policing programs with Homeland Security practices.

2.1 History of Community Oriented Policing

Community policing focuses on crime and social disorder through the delivery of police services that includes aspects of traditional law enforcement, as well as prevention, problem-solving, community engagement, and partnerships. The

community policing model balances reactive responses to calls for service with proactive problem-solving centered on the causes of crime and disorder. Community policing requires police and citizens to join together as partners in the course of both identifying and effectively addressing these issues (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006). On July 15, 2002 former United States Attorney General John Ashcroft stated, "Since law enforcement agencies began partnering with citizens through community policing, we've seen significant drops in crime rates" (About the Training, 2002, <http://cop.spcollege.edu/cop/training/train.htm>).

Sir Robert Peel stated in 1829, "The police are the public and the public are the police. The police are only members of the public that are paid to give full time attention to duties that are incumbent upon every citizen in the interest of community welfare and existence" (Sir Robert Peel, 1829, <http://www.answers.com/topic/sir-robert-peel>). This statement emphasizes the epitome of Community Oriented Policing. Peel, commonly referred to as the father of modern day policing, instituted several innovative policing techniques more than 150 years ago in London, England. Among these techniques was assigning of Bobbies (British Police) to specific geographic areas throughout the city. These geographic areas later became known as and are commonly referred to even today as "beats." According to Patterson (1995), Peel assigned Bobbies to specific geographic zones and held them responsible for preventing and suppressing crime within the boundaries of their zones. He based this strategy on his belief that the officers would:

- Become known to the public, thus citizens with information about criminal activity would be more likely to tell a familiar figure than a stranger.

- Become familiar with people and places and thus better able to recognize suspicious persons or criminal activity.
- Be highly visible on their posts, tending to deter criminals from committing crimes in the immediate vicinity (Patterson, 1995).

These principles were adopted as American cities slowly developed police departments. New York had over a half million people before it got a permanent police department in 1853, Boston about 175,000 (1859), and Philadelphia about 250,000 (1856) (Monkkonen, 2006). According to Monkkonen (2006), cities created their police departments for a variety of reasons. The new American system differed from the European police forces by establishing a command structure that held officers relatively accountable. Additionally, the wearing of uniforms helped citizens to easily recognize their police officers. Uniforms also served to keep the officers out of bars and on patrol. Sir Robert Peel's innovation of regular patrol beats was incorporated with patrolling in uniform and many hoped this would deter crime by scaring criminals.

Thayer & Reynolds (1997) traced the concept of Community Oriented Policing to Arthur Woods, who served as Chief of Police in New York City from 1914 to 1919. Woods understood that during the early 1900's, the community viewed the police as mostly unprofessional and as a corrupt organization. According to Thayer & Reynolds (1997), Woods based his conclusions on public reactions when dealing with police personnel and also the lack of interaction between officers and the community outside of the traditional police role. Woods attempted to make the profession respectable and improve the department's image by changing the attitude of his officers and providing them a feeling of dignity and professionalism. Woods recognized that the police were

there to serve the community at large. Although Woods was viewed as successful by the community, his officers forced him out for political reasons.

American police, who once charged citizens for services rendered for them, began receiving salaries from the city government and no longer charged citizens for their services (Monkkonen, 2006). Some criminologists believed this change encouraged officers to be more helpful to the poor. However, when officers received their salaries from a government agency, it allowed politicians to hire officers for political reasons which often lead to corruption. According to Monkkonen (2006), police officers were also partisan workers for incumbent political parties, working to get out the vote or, sometimes, to prevent people from voting. Another benefit received from the uniformed officers was their command presence on the streets. Officers helped strangers with directions, performed various community services, helped children, enforced laws, and directed traffic.

At the end of the nineteenth century, police departments became more diverse in an attempt and reflected a closer representation of the demographics of the city by hiring minorities and women (Monkkonen, 2006). Minorities were often deployed to minority neighborhoods. By the mid-1960s most police departments had some black officers; Washington, D.C., had the most, with blacks composing about 20 percent of the force and women were hired as "matrons" to oversee lost children, women's lodging rooms, and women prisoners (Monkkonen, 2006). Until 1968, women could not have full time patrol positions (Indianapolis lead the way). In the late 1970s, pressure from

civil rights groups changed the way police departments across the United States recruited. They began hiring more women and minorities.

The philosophy of Community Oriented Policing became popular in the 1950's and 1960's with the introduction of community relations programs. These programs, which were designed to increase the interaction between the community (especially the minority community) and the police, continued through the 1970s with the team policing concept (Greene, 1987). Team policing was a police method utilized in the late 1960's and early 1970's and focused on efficient and effective policing, improved police / community relations, assignment of police teams, and enhanced police officer morale (Sherman, 1973). Despite the fact that the team-policing concept failed in some organizations, the principles of community policing remained intact. Kelling (1996) identified three reasons for the emergence of community-policing. The first was, not surprisingly, citizens' disenchantment with police services. "Minority citizens in inner cities continued to be frustrated by the police who whisked in and out of their neighborhoods with little sensitivity to community norms and values" (Kelling, 1996). The second reason was based on concerned social science research in the 1970's. Specifically, "research about preventative patrols, rapid response to calls for service, and investigative work – the three mainstays of police tactics – was uniformly discouraging" (Kelling, 1996). The third reason for reform identified by Kelling was that "... patrol officers have been frustrated with their traditional role" (Kelling, 1996), and that they began to demand improved methods of interacting with citizens, which would help improve morale (Worrall & Zhao, 2003)." The Community Oriented

Policing philosophy led to several famous studies that were used to determine if these philosophies had a direct correlation to a decrease in crime.

2.2 Community Oriented Policing Studies Funded By Grants

In academic literature there are two well known Community Oriented Policing studies: the Kansas City Study and the Newark Foot Patrol Theory. These prominent studies were both funded by law enforcement grants made possible by the Police Foundation. The Kansas City, Missouri, Police Department conducted an experiment from October 1, 1972, through September 30, 1973, designed to measure the impact routine patrols had on the total number of crimes committed and the public's fear of crime (Kelling, Pate, Dieckman, & Brown, 1974). The year-long Kansas City experiment tested the effectiveness of the traditional police strategy of routine preventive patrol and sought to determine whether the resources in the Kansas City, Missouri, Police Department ordinarily allocated to preventive patrol could safely be devoted to other, perhaps more productive, strategies (Kelling, et al., 1974/2003). Three controlled levels of routine preventive patrol were used in the experimental areas. One area, termed "reactive," received no preventive patrol. Officers entered the area only in response to citizens' calls for assistance. This, in effect, substantially reduced police visibility in that area. In the second area, called "proactive," police visibility was increased two to three times its usual level. In the third area, termed "control," the normal level of patrol was maintained. Analysis of the data gathered revealed that the three areas experienced no significant differences in the level of crime, citizen's attitudes toward police services, citizen's fear of crime, police response time, or

citizen's satisfaction with police response time (Kelling, et al., 1974/2003). It can be argued that if they had not received a law enforcement grant this study may not have occurred.

Another major Community Oriented Policing study funded by a grant was the Newark Foot Patrol Theory. In 1973, the New Jersey state legislature passed the Safe and Clean Neighborhoods Act. This was the first act of its kind in the nation and was appropriately named as the intention of the act was to create safe and clean neighborhoods. Police foot patrols were specifically mandated in an effort to enhance the presence and visibility of police officers in the community. The Police Foundation evaluated foot patrol in 28 New Jersey cities and Newark was selected as the primary evaluation site. The evaluation began in February 1978 and ended in January 1979. The Police Foundation found that introducing foot patrols in a mix of police strategies significantly enhances the citizens' perception of safety in the neighborhood (Kelling et al., 1974). This is something no other police strategy had been able to do. According to the Newark Foot Patrol Theory, introducing foot patrols seemed to have little effect on crime rates, but it did have the following positive effects:

- Residents knew when officers were patrolling their neighborhoods on foot.
- Residents in areas patrolled by officers on foot thought that crime was less of a problem than did residents in areas with only motorized patrol.
- Residents in areas with foot patrol felt safer and less likely to be victimized.
- Residents living in areas with foot patrol took fewer steps to protect themselves against crime (demonstrating a perception that there was less fear of crime).
- Residents in areas with foot patrol were more satisfied with police services.

Residents in the areas in which foot patrols were conducted had noticeable changes in their attitudes about crime and their perception of safety and livability of

their neighborhoods. The residents also had a higher level of satisfaction with police service. The “broken window theory” was derived from the Newark Foot Patrol study. Similar to the Kansas City Study, one might surmise that without a law enforcement grant this study may not have occurred.

2.3 The Office of Community Oriented Policing Services

Community Oriented Policing became a household term in 1994 when President Bill Clinton created the office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) under the United States Department of Justice. President Clinton’s goal was to increase police staffing by more than 114,000 officers whose primary job responsibilities would be related to Community Oriented Policing and crime prevention / suppression (Zhao, Lovrich, & Thurman, 1999). It seems apparent that the increase of 114,000 police officers was made possible with the introduction of numerous competitive grant programs that were available to law enforcement agencies nationwide. Additionally, one might assume as the competition between agencies for limited funds increased, applicants who had the best written grants stood to receive more funds. Over the past ten years, Community Oriented Policing has become the dominant theme of organizational change in law enforcement (Cordner, 1997; Maguire, 1997; Zhao, Lovrich & Thurman, 1999.) The COPS Office was created as a result of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (Roth & Ryan, 2000). As a component of the Justice Department, the mission of the COPS Office is to advance community policing in jurisdictions of all sizes across the country. Community policing

represents a shift from more traditional law enforcement in that it focuses on prevention of crime and the fear of crime on a very local basis (Zhao, Lovrich, & Thurman, 1999). Community policing puts law enforcement professionals on the streets and assigns them a beat so they can build mutually beneficial relationships with the people they serve. By earning the trust of the members of their communities and making those individuals stakeholders in their own safety, community policing makes law enforcement safer and more efficient, and makes America safer (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006).

The Community Oriented Policing Services Office provided financial support to law enforcement through a variety of grant programs. Since the creation of the COPS Office in 1994, more than \$9 billion has been dispersed, mostly through competitive grants awarded to local, county and state law enforcement agencies, with the goal to advance community policing (Zhao, Lovrich, & Thurman, 1999). The COPS Office funding supported a wide range of activities allowing law enforcement agencies to hire new officers, equip them with the tools needed to be functional, and train them in new community policing practices. Additionally, existing officers were redeployed into their communities and studies were conducted to determine ways to maximize the impact the police had on the people who live there. COPS funded a wide variety of strategies to advance community policing through innovative techniques and technologies. In order to use this funding to advance community policing, jurisdictions had to apply for it (United States Department of Justice, 2005). It was important for agencies to understand

grants and grant writing in order to take advantage of the programs and services being offered by the COPS Office.

2.3.1 Timeline of the Office of Community Oriented Police Services

The distribution of grant funds is apparent in the COPS Office timeline. The following represents a timeline of accomplishments and milestones that denote the successes of the Department of Justice; Office of Community Oriented Police Service:

1994

- The Violent Crime Control & Law Enforcement Act passed both the House and the Senate, authorizing \$8.8 billion expenditure over six years. The Office of Community Oriented Policing Services is created to distribute and monitor these funds.
- COPS launched three new programs: Accelerated Hiring, Education, And Deployment (AHEAD), Funding Accelerated for Smaller Towns (FAST), and Making Officer Redeployment Effective (MORE).
- COPS awarded \$200 million to 392 agencies for 2,700 additional community policing professionals.
- Total program funding for fiscal year 1994: \$148.4 million.

1995

- COPS funded 25,000 more officers.
- COPS announced the Universal Hiring Program (UHP), which incorporates FAST and AHEAD.
- COPS awarded grants totaling \$10 million through the Youth Firearms Violence Initiative.
- Total program funding for fiscal year 1995: \$1.225 billion.

1996

- COPS funded more than 52,000 officers through UHP.
- COPS announced its Anti-Gang Initiative and Community Policing to Combat Domestic Violence Program.

- COPS announced its Problem-Solving Partnership initiative.
- Total program funding for fiscal year 1996: \$1,209 billion.

1997

- COPS published and released a report entitled Police Integrity: Public Service with Honor.
- COPS funding established a nationwide network of Regional Community Policing Institutes (RCPIs).
- Total program funding for fiscal year 1997: \$983.9 million

1998

- COPS had now funded 75,000 new community policing professionals nationwide.
- COPS introduced three new programs: Distressed Neighborhoods Pilot Project, Police Corps Program, and Small Communities Grant Program.
- COPS launched the Methamphetamine Program which awarded \$34 million its initial fiscal year.
- COPS awarded a total of \$38 million through its Technology Program.
- Total program funding for fiscal year 1998: \$1.490 billion.

1999

- COPS announced its COPS in Schools (CIS) grant program.
- COPS funded its 100,000th community policing professional in May of 1999.
- COPS announced its Tribal Resources Grant Program (TRGP).
- Total program funding for fiscal year 1999: \$1.127 billion

2000

- COPS launched the Police as Problem-Solvers and Peacemakers program, which awarded \$1 million to five law enforcement agencies.
- COPS announced the Justice-Based After School (JBAS) and Value-Based Initiatives (VBI) programs.

- COPS awarded \$12 million to 41 state law enforcement agencies for the purchase of 2,900 in-car cameras.
- Total program funding for fiscal year 2000: \$685.3 million.

2001

- COPS launched two new series of publications: COPS Innovations and Problem-Oriented Policing Guides.
- COPS awarded \$600,000 through JBAS to seven law enforcement agencies.
- COPS supported the NYPD and Arlington County Police Department as they respond to the September 11th attacks.
- Total program funding for fiscal year 2001: \$558.1 million

2002

- COPS awarded more than \$70 million through the Methamphetamine Program.
- COPS awarded more than \$154 million through the Technology Program.
- COPS announced \$128 million in UHP grants that allowed 367 agencies to hire 1750 community policing professionals.
- Total program funding for fiscal year 2002: \$656.9 million

2003

- COPS launched the Homeland Security Overtime Program (HSOP) and awarded \$59.6 million to 294 law enforcement agencies throughout the U.S.
- The Interoperable Communications Technology Program was created by COPS. Through this program COPS awarded \$66.5 million to 14 communities to develop integrated communications networks among emergency response agencies within the city's metropolitan area.
- COPS announced \$178 million in UHP funding to 364 agencies to hire 2,334 community policing professionals.
- COPS announced over \$41 million in CIS grants. These grants supported 152 law enforcement agencies in the hiring of 348 school resource officers.
- Total program funding for fiscal year 2003: \$635 million.

2004

- COPS awards \$47.2 million in grants through the Universal Hiring Program to be used by local police and sheriff's departments to employ additional officers. The grants were awarded to 178 law enforcement agencies, and will be used to hire 905 community policing officers.
- COPS allocated \$4.6 million in funding for 19 jurisdictions to combat methamphetamine. The funds were awarded under COPS Methamphetamine Training Initiative, which assisted law enforcement agencies in developing and enhancing comprehensive methamphetamine eradication strategies that emphasize training and technical assistance.
- More than \$82 million in grants was awarded to 23 communities in 17 states to develop interoperable communication networks. The grants covered the purchase of communication equipment, enhancements to communication infrastructures, data information sharing systems and project management expenses associated with upgrading interoperable communication systems.
- Awarded \$24 million to 114 tribal law enforcement agencies in 24 states under COPS Tribal Resources Grant Program (TRGP) (COPS History, 2005).

The history of Community Oriented Policing is clear. However, on September 11, 2001, the priorities in law enforcement changed nationwide, in every city, in every size department and a new term was derived: Homeland Security. This paradigm shift also changed the model of law enforcement grants and grant priorities.

2.4 Homeland Security Initiatives

President George W. Bush stated on January 11, 2005 that “We are engaged in a daily mission to prepare effective responses to any future attack... Our nation is still at war. We’re focused. We’re taking decisive actions on the home front that are critical to winning this war” (Homeland Security, Budget-in-Brief, 2006, page 2). One can maintain that there was a noticeable impact at local, county and state level through the

appropriation of numerous grants relating to Homeland Security and our war on terrorism.

It cannot be logically disputed that the events of September 11, 2001 forever changed the lives of the American people and the manner in which governments conduct business. Then environment was transformed from a Community Oriented Policing philosophy to a protecting ourselves mentality. The new Department of Homeland Security's (DHS) three primary missions are: Prevent terrorist attacks within the United States, reduce America's vulnerability to terrorism, and minimize the damage from potential attacks and natural disasters (United States Department of Homeland Security, 2006). Their Mission Statement is: "The Department of Homeland Security will lead the unified national effort to secure America. We will prevent and deter terrorist attacks and protect against and respond to threats and hazards to the nation. We will ensure safe and secure borders, welcome lawful immigrants and visitors, and promote the free-flow of commerce."

The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, on New York and Washington, D.C., may be seen among other things as assaults on American cities as urban places (Eisinger, 2004). It would not be surprising in this light if Americans began to rethink the role and functions of cities in the aftermath of terror (Eisinger, 2004). The government certainly did. According to Eisinger (2004) the first governmental impact of the terrorist attacks on cities is that municipal governments took on new and costly security responsibilities in an intergovernmental environment in which the state and

federal government partnerships has often been perceived as both dilatory and unresponsive.

It can be argued that the world and community we lived in would never be the same. Many fear we would enter a state of isolationism and paranoia to the point that we would lock ourselves in our houses and sacrifice our core values and freedoms. Peter Marcuse (2002) was among the most emphatic of these pessimists, warning of the erosion of urban democracy, the closing of public spaces, and the emergence of the citadel city, a fortress protected by “pervasive surveillance.” While this was not perceived to be an attack on the economy, many surmised that no one would build skyscrapers, or want to work or live in downtown buildings. Businesses would increasingly move to suburban locations, and business travel and tourism would never return to pre 9/11 levels. Along with shifts in the mentality of citizens was a dramatic “knee-jerk” reaction by the government in response to the attacks.

According to Poinke (2001) within days of the collapse of the World Trade Center Towers, the National League of Cities (NLC) polled 456 of its member cities to find out how they were responding to the appearance of massive terror on American soil. Communities of all sizes and in all parts of the country had set about immediately to secure water supplies, assign guards to critical transportation facilities and government buildings, alert hospitals and public health departments to stand by, and convene officials to discuss emergency plans. Within a year of the attack, President George W. Bush proposed a new department for the United States Government. The Department of Homeland Security consolidated 22 agencies and 180,000 employees.

The new agency was designed to unify federal functions into a single agency dedicated to protecting America from terrorism. This new agency also became a source for federal law enforcement grants relating to Homeland Security and the war on terrorism (Department of Homeland Security, 2005)

2.5 The Department of Homeland Security

On July 13, 2005, Secretary Michael Chertoff announced a six-point agenda for the Department of Homeland Security designed to ensure that the Department's policies, operations, and structures are aligned in the best way to address the potential threats – both present and future – that face our nation (United States Department of Homeland Security, 2005). Secretary Chertoff stated, “Our Department must drive improvement with a sense of urgency. Our enemy constantly changes and adapts, so we as a Department must be nimble and decisive” (United States Department of Homeland Security, 2005, http://www.dhs.gov/xnews/releases/press_release_0703.shtm). The Secretary's six-point agenda will guide DHS in the near term and result in changes that will:

- Increase overall preparedness, particularly for catastrophic events;
- Create better transportation security systems to move people and cargo more securely and efficiently;
- Strengthen border security and interior enforcement and reform immigration processes;
- Enhance information sharing with our partners;
- Improve DHS' financial management, human resource development, procurement and information technology; and
- Realign the DHS organization to maximize mission performance (United States Department of Homeland Security, 2005).

Secretary Chertoff announced that details of new policy initiatives in these six areas will be announced in the coming weeks and months, including:

- Securing our borders through additional personnel, new technologies, infrastructure investments, and interior enforcement - coupled with efforts to reduce the demand for illegal border migration by channeling migrants seeking work into regulated legal channels;
- Restructuring the current immigration process to enhance security and improve customer service;
- Reaching out to state Homeland Security officials to improve information exchange protocols, refine the Homeland Security Advisory System, support state and regional data fusion centers, and address other topics of mutual concern; and
- Investing in the Department's most important asset – its people – with top-notch professional career training and development efforts (United States Department of Homeland Security, 2005).

It can be argued that knowing the mission and the six priorities of the DHS could enhance a grant writer's application if they incorporate keywords or philosophies into their applications.

When a bipartisan senate and congress approved the creation of the Department of Homeland Security, funding had to come from an already stretched federal budget. It appears that the United States Department of Justice – Community Oriented Policing Services sustained substantial budget cuts that dramatically decreased funding for Community Oriented Policing programs, including the number of competitive law enforcement grants available to local, county and state law enforcement agencies.

According to the White House's Homeland Security website, more than \$18 billion has been awarded to state and local governments for Homeland Security initiatives, replacing Community Oriented Policing grants (Whitehouse.gov, 2006). Department of Homeland Security includes law enforcement grants awarded by the

Office of Domestic Preparedness (ODP), the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), and the Transportation Security Administration (TSA). Other federal entities who administer grants include the Department of Health and Human Services' public health preparedness grants, Department of Justice grants for counter-terrorism and general-purpose law enforcement activities, and Environmental Protection Agency grants for enhancing the security of our nation's water supplies (Department of Homeland Security, 2005). Unlike the USDOJ – COPS grants, which were primarily awarded to law enforcement agencies and the courts, Homeland Security grants are awarded to hospitals, fire departments, water districts, utility companies, and other government agencies for uses other than law enforcement. Congress did mandate that a small percentage of funding must be awarded to municipal, county and state law enforcement agencies. This percentage is far less than the amounts previously received by law enforcement.

The proposed 2006 budget for the Department of Justice has been set at \$22.5 billion, up 1% from 2005 (SFGate.com 2005). According to SFGate.com (2005), the Community Oriented Policing Services, or COPS program, would be cut from \$499 million to \$22 million, virtually eliminating the program, and the law enforcement grant programs that are included. It can be easily argued that decreased funding in grants will result in increased competition, and only the best written and research grants will receive funding. This funding is down from the more than \$1 billion annually it once had (SFGate.com 2005). However, it appears that the Department of Homeland Security's budget continues to increase.

The President's FY 2006 budget request was \$41.1 billion for the Department of Homeland Security (Whitehouse.gov, 2006). This is an increase in total budgetary authority of 7 percent over the enacted FY 2005 funding, excluding Project BioShield, clearly demonstrates the Administration's continued commitment to making further improvements to the nation's safety. Among the operating entities with significant budgetary increases are Immigration and Customs Enforcement (up 13.5%) and the U.S. Coast Guard (up more than 9%, adjusting for transferred programs). The budget also streamlines screening programs, increasing resources for these activities under a new screening office by 68 percent (United States Department of Homeland Security, 2005).

2.6 Grant Funding Pre & Post 9/11

In September, 1994 the Crime Act earmarked \$30.2 billion over six years for programs such as the addition of 100,000 new police officers to the streets, continued implementation of community policing, and the enforcement of the Brady Bill (Ross, 2000). The act also provided funds for the building of prisons and boot camps, limitations on prisoners' appeals, expansion of the death penalty to major federal crimes, reduction of domestic violence and bans on assault rifles (Ross, 2000). Approximately 13,000 law enforcement agencies of the estimated 18,000 nation-wide have received funding / grants from the United States Department of Justice – Community Oriented Policing Services Office (72%). The COPS office provides grants to tribal, state, and local law enforcement agencies to hire and train community policing

professionals, acquire and deploy cutting-edge crime-fighting technologies, and develop and test innovative policing strategies. COPS-funded training helps advance community policing at all levels of law enforcement - from line officers to law enforcement executives - as well as others in the criminal justice field. Because community policing is by definition inclusive, COPS training also reaches state and local government leaders and the citizens they serve. This broad range of programs helps COPS offer agencies support in virtually every aspect of law enforcement, and it's making America safer, one neighborhood at a time. COPS has invested \$11.3 billion to add community policing officers to the nation's streets and schools, enhance crime-fighting technology, support crime prevention initiatives, and provide training and technical assistance to advance community policing. At the end of fiscal year 2004, COPS had funded more than 118,768 community policing officers and deputies (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006.). According to Worrall & Zhao (2003), organizations (law enforcement) must interact and work with other organizations (United States Department of Justice – COPS Office, 2006) to acquire the needed resources to begin, prolong, or enhance community policing philosophies in their communities.

The first official grant offered by the COPS Office was the Advancing Community Policing Program. The COPS office designed the Advancing Community Policing (ACP) program to assist local law enforcement agencies in their quest to develop the means to sustain community policing practices. The COPS office announced two categories of the ACP grants in 1997: Organizational Change and Community Policing Demonstration Centers. Organizational Change grants assisted

local law enforcement agencies to reexamine current practices and to develop and enhance community policing philosophies. These grants helped agencies change organizational-level challenges (resistance to change) and created an atmosphere in which community policing took root. Law enforcement applicants were required to have a proven track record in community policing successes, and the ACP grant proposals had to propose changing the culture / beliefs of one of the following elements in their organization:

- Leadership and Management
- Organizational Culture
- Modifying Organizational Structures
- Research and Planning
- Reengineering Other Components of the Organization (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006).

Unfortunately only a few law enforcement agencies had taken the lead in developing and implementing community policing philosophies and practices throughout their departments. The second part of the ACP grants was the establishment of Community Policing Demonstration Centers. According to the USDOJ, the Community Policing Demonstration Center's purpose was to enhance accepted community policing strategies and to develop new ideas to map the future of community policing. These applicants were required to have multi-year strategic community policing plans in place (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006).

2.6.1 Personnel Grants

Among the most popular grants with the COPS office is the law enforcement hiring grants such as the FAST (Funding Accelerated for Smaller Towns) Grant. "The

COPS FAST program was designed to provide funding directly to local, state, and tribal jurisdictions for the salaries and benefits of newly hired officers engaged in community policing.” COPS FAST was one of the first hiring programs that funded ways to assist local law enforcement agencies in developing partnerships with their communities and finding innovative ways to solve crime issues (Community Oriented Policing). The COPS FAST provided funding for 75 percent of a newly hired entry-level officer's salary and benefits, up to a maximum of \$75,000 per officer, over the three-year grant period. The recipient of the grant was required to match 25% or greater if the salaries were more (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006). Newly hired officers and / or veteran officers were then tasked with going into their communities to establish a partnership. According to the COPS website, there was one announcement in March 1995 for the FAST grant program, after which approximately \$400 million was awarded to more than 6,700 law enforcement agencies with populations of less than 50,000. Larger jurisdictions were funded under the COPS AHEAD grant program (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006). These grants were competitive and required agencies to submit applications that were evaluated and scored. It is presumed that only those with the highest scores received funding.

The COPS AHEAD (Accelerated Hiring, Education, and Deployment) program, similar to the FAST grant, was designed to provide grant funding directly to local, state, and tribal jurisdictions for the salaries and benefits of newly hired officers engaged in community policing. The COPS Office funds were awarded to assist law enforcement agencies in developing partnerships with their communities with the goal of addressing

and solving long-standing crime problems. The AHEAD program served jurisdictions with populations greater than 50,000 (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006).

Like the FAST grants, the COPS AHEAD grants also provided funding for 75 percent of a newly hired entry-level officer's salary and benefits, up to \$75,000 per officer, over the three-year grant period (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006). The AHEAD grant program, which was announced in April 1995, awarded approximately \$284 million to almost 500 law enforcement agencies to fund the hiring of nearly 4,000 officers. AHEAD and FAST were later merged into the COPS Universal Hiring Program (UHP) (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006).

The COPS Office Universal Hiring Program (UHP) grants provide funding directly to local, state, and tribal jurisdictions for the salaries and benefits of newly hired officers engaged in community policing (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006). The COPS Office awards UHP funds to law enforcement agencies which create, or have created, partnerships in their communities in an effort to develop creative and innovative programs to combat long-standing community issues. The UHP grant provides funding to awarded communities, regardless of population / square mileage, for the hiring of police officers and sheriffs' deputies. These newly-hired, sworn personnel then engage in community policing. As with the FAST and AHEAD programs, UHP provides federal funding for 75 percent of a newly hired entry-level officer's salary and benefits, up to a maximum amount of \$75,000 per officer, over the

course of the three-year grant period (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006). Departments are generally required to contribute at least 25 percent in local matching funds, unless the recipient agency is approved for a waiver of the local match based upon a demonstration of extraordinary fiscal hardship (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006). The COPS Office, to date, has announced 62 rounds of Universal Hiring Program funding since September 1995 (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006).

The Community Oriented Policing Services Office has awarded approximately \$4.76 billion under FAST, AHEAD, and UHP to hire more than 64,000 officers as of August 2004 (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006). Please note that there were no open solicitations for UHP in 2004 or 2005 (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006).

The COPS In Schools (CIS) grant program is designed to assist law enforcement agencies by adding additional officers to their forces. The new officers on patrol will allow veteran officers to serve as school resource officers (SROs) and engage in community policing in and around primary and secondary schools. The CIS grants provide incentives for law enforcement agencies to develop partnerships with the schools in their community and to use community policing practices to prevent school violence (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006). The COPS In Schools program awards a maximum of \$125,000 per officer position approved for salary and benefit costs over the three-year grant period (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006). Any remaining costs are required to be paid by the local

agency (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006). All agencies that apply must also demonstrate that they have primary law enforcement authority in the jurisdictions in which the school(s) is located. The applicant must also demonstrate their inability to implement this project without federal assistance. Funding will begin when the new officers are hired (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006).

The United States Department of Justice COPS office (2006) has announced 19 rounds of funding under the COPS In Schools program, including five that were a part of the Safe Schools / Healthy Students Initiative, a joint initiative between the Departments of Justice, Education, and Health and Human Services. The Safe Schools / Healthy Students grant program was developed to provide students, schools, and communities with the benefit of enhanced educational, mental health, and law enforcement services to promote a comprehensive, healthy childhood development. The COPS Office announced the first round of the CIS program in April 1999, and the most recent in September 2004 (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006). The COPS Office has awarded in excess of \$748 million to more than 3,000 grantees to hire more than 6,500 SROs through the CIS program (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006). The COPS Office has provided more than \$10 million to hire approximately 100 SROs through the Safe Schools / Healthy Students program (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006). In addition, in FY 2004 the CIS program coordinated with the Office of Justice Programs (OJP) and other Department of Justice components to provide funding for SROs to three agencies for 12 positions (\$1.5 million in federal funding) in conjunction with OJP's Gang Reduction

Project (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006). Another grant, which was utilized by the United States Department of Justice's COPS Office in their pursuit of adding 100,000 new police officers to the nation's force, was the Making Officer Redeployment Effective grant (MORE).

2.6.2 Equipment Grants

The COPS' Making Officer Redeployment Effective program's goal was to increase the amount of time law enforcement officers could devote to community policing by funding technology, equipment, and support staff, including civilian personnel (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006). To accomplish this, the COPS Office introduced a series of competitive grants for law enforcement agencies. One can reason that these grants were highly competitive requiring grant writers to submit accurate applications within the predetermined criteria of the grantor. The COPS' MORE grants covered up to 75 percent of the total cost of technology, equipment, or civilian salaries for one year. This required law enforcement agencies awarded grants to provide a minimum local match of 25 percent (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006). Waivers of the local cash match are granted only in cases of extreme local fiscal hardship.

Agencies that applied for COPS MORE grants had to demonstrate that their proposed program would increase the number of current law enforcement officers deployed into community policing by an equal or greater measure than would a COPS

grant for hiring new officers (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006).

In addition to redeploying officers into community policing, the COPS MORE program significantly increased the ability of officers across the country to address community issues. An example is when a technology funded agency adds mobile in-car computers to its fleet. The computers enable officers to respond more quickly and to have more resources / data so they improve their ability to fight / prevent crime. The COPS MORE grants have been awarded in 1995, 1996, 1998, 2000, 2001 and 2002(United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006). The guidelines have been similar every year, with the following exceptions: in 1995, overtime costs were allowable; in 2000, only support personnel were awarded; and only equipment and technology systems were funded in 2001 and 2002 (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006).

Through COPS MORE '95 and '96, over \$530 million was awarded for the redeployment of more than 22,000 officers and deputies (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006). The total amount of funding for MORE '98 was \$437.6 million, and MORE 2000 awarded in excess of \$38 million to over 600 agencies (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006). Through MORE 2001, \$81 million was awarded to 546 agencies across the country. The most recent MORE funding, MORE 2002, awarded an additional 297 agencies with \$62 million (United States Department of Justice, 2005). The COPS Office also earmarks grants for special groups including tribal police departments.

2.6.3 Tribal Resource Grant Program

“The COPS Tribal Resources Grant Program (TRGP) is a broad, comprehensive plan designed to meet law enforcement needs in Native American communities” (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006). No TRGP Grants were researched as part of the study due to their uniqueness and special characteristics. This grant offers a wide variety of funding in areas such as hiring additional police officers, law enforcement training, uniforms, basic-issue equipment, emerging technologies, and police vehicles. Like other COPS grants, the Tribal Resources Grant Program funds cover a maximum federal share of 75 percent of total project costs (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006). This includes approved salaries and fringe benefits of new, additional, entry-level police officer positions (up to a maximum of \$75,000 per officer over the three-year grant period), basic law enforcement training and equipment, vehicles, and technology. A local cash match requirement of 25 percent of total project costs is required in this program. Waivers of the local match requirement may be granted only on the basis of a documented demonstration of fiscal hardship, and waiver requests must be made at the time of application (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006).

Items that are not allowed under TRGP include, but are not exclusive of, salaries and benefits for existing employees, civilian salaries and benefits, overtime, office equipment, office furniture and supplies, televisions, VCRs, video cameras (other than in-car), ammunition, dogs, radar guns, and vehicle maintenance. Basic/academy training

is mandatory for all new officers hired under TRGP grants. They must be registered for training within six months of their date of hire. Department personnel must attend required training in community policing and grant management when they receive their first grant. All federally recognized tribes with established police departments, or tribes that wish to establish departments, are eligible to apply for TRGP funding. In addition, tribes that are currently served by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) law enforcement may request funding under TRGP to supplement their existing police services (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006).

According to the United States Department of Justice (2006), in 2004 there was more than \$25 million awarded to 114 agencies through COPS TRGP. Since fiscal year 1999, the COPS Office has disbursed more than \$260 million to improve public safety in Native American communities. The COPS Office has funded a wide variety of other tribal-focused projects and programs in the past, including funding for the Mental Health and Community Safety Initiative for American Indian/Alaska Native (AI/AN) Children, Youth, and Families (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006). This initiative demonstrates collaboration among the Departments of Education, Health and Human Services, and Justice. It was designed to address the mental health, behavioral, and substance abuse needs of Native American youth and their families, and to provide a range of support services and programs both in the community and in the school arena (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006). It can be assumed that the grant applications are competitive and a similar model and study could be conducted that includes tribal grants.

2.7 Special Program Grants

The COPS Office also funds special projects outside the scope of adding / redeploying police officers. “COPS advances community policing in a wide variety of ways. Special projects are a few of the ways COPS funding currently supports very focused activities, most of which target either a specific problem or an innovative solution. These projects develop methodologies, best practices, or responses that can be documented and replicated elsewhere. Many of these projects have developed products that are available to the law enforcement community and the general public through the COPS Office. Some special projects, such as in-car cameras and technology grants, are designed to fund wider implementation of specific tools that make law enforcement professionals safer and more effective. COPS Special Projects showcase innovative community policing strategies that can deliver surprising results” (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006). Special Projects have funded programs such as 3-1-1 call systems (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006). The COPS Office (2006) supported the use of 3-1-1 call systems as a method of alleviating the cycle of reactive policing and thereby enhancing community policing efforts. 3-1-1 diverts non-emergency calls from 9-1-1 systems and allows police officers more time to engage in community policing activities and respond to citizens with true emergencies (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006). Special Program grants were not researched as part of this study, but comparable data could be analyzed by creating a similar Grant Instrument and thus improve and enhance grant applications for special projects.

Another program funded under Special Programs initiatives was the Promoting Cooperative Strategies to Reduce Racial Profiling. This project provided funds to local, county, and state law enforcement agencies to respond proactively to racial profiling. The Reducing Racial Profiling initiative developed a “best practices and technical assistance guide” to assist police departments in reducing racial profiling by helping local law enforcement agencies create and strengthen their efforts to build trust between the police and its citizens. The COPS Office funded the following projects under this program: recruitment and selection, training and education of police and community members, minority community engagement initiatives, accountability and supervision, collecting and analyzing traffic stop data, and using technology to reduce racial profiling and increase officer safety. To date, the COPS Office has funded 21 sites at approximately \$200,000 each (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006).

Methamphetamines are another epidemic being addressed by the COPS Office. The COPS methamphetamine grants are designed to help state and local law enforcement agencies in their efforts to reduce the production, distribution, and use of methamphetamine. Approximately \$300 million have been awarded since 1998 under the COPS methamphetamine grants (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006). These grants hope to enhance community policing by encouraging its recipients to build partnerships with various community leaders, local fire departments, drug courts, prosecutors, child protective services, treatment providers, and other law enforcement agencies in an effort to create a coordinated response to the

methamphetamine epidemic. COPS grants have funded equipment, training, and personnel to improve intelligence-gathering capabilities, enforcement efforts, lab clean-ups, training related to drug-endangered children, and the prosecution of those who engage in methamphetamine-related crimes. The COPS Office has also awarded \$82 million to the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) for clandestine methamphetamine lab clean-ups, specialized enforcement training, and statewide methamphetamine summits (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006).

The COPS Office offers, or has offered, several other special grants designed to further their mission of Community Oriented Policing. However, after September 11, 2001, funding for the agency and its position as the cognizant (lead funding department) agency for most law enforcement has to be re-examined. In our Post 9/11 environment, it can be argued that Community Oriented Policing has oftentimes been passed over in furtherance of Homeland Security initiatives. In response, the COPS Office began to offer several grants that incorporated Community Oriented Policing initiatives with Homeland Security priorities. These grants are competitive by design and were incorporated into this study.

2.8 Homeland Security Initiatives

Among these grants was the COPS Interoperable Communications Technology Program that provides funding to assist local cities and communities to develop effective interoperable communications systems for public safety and emergency service providers. Interoperable Communications Technology grants fund projects that

use equipment and technologies to increase interoperability among government public safety providers. Grant awards to these communities are the result of thorough planning and emphasize how new technologies and procedures help communities achieve interoperability (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006).

In FY 2003, the COPS Office awarded more than \$66 million to agencies to address the growing need for interoperable communications technology (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006). The FY 2004 COPS Interoperable Communications Technology Program targeted specific jurisdictions and had approximately \$80 million to award (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006). Applications were sent to law enforcement agencies requesting proposals that are multi-jurisdictional and multi-disciplinary. It is believed that this grant will remain a current funding source and should be slated for more rounds of awards. Another grant that incorporates community policing and Homeland Security was the COPS Office Homeland Security Overtime Program (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006). Radio-interoperability is arguably a major concern of law enforcement due to the costs associated with state-of-the-art radio equipment. The large grant awards make this grant highly competitive. The use of a model to assist grant writers could enhance the chances of receiving funding.

The COPS Homeland Security Overtime Program (HSOP) was implemented to supplement awarded agencies, state or local, with funds for officer overtime, thereby increasing the amount of budgeted overtime available to support community policing and Homeland Security efforts for one year. HSOP grants were used to pay an officer's

overtime during Homeland Security training sessions and other law enforcement activities that are designed to help prevent acts of terrorism and other violent or drug-related crimes. HSOP funds could only be used to support the overtime efforts of non-supervisory, sworn personnel such as intelligence officers, crime analysts, undercover officers, and others who work on Homeland Security or terrorism task forces. Departments receiving HSOP awards were required to contribute at least 25 percent in local matching funds. The first COPS HSOP announcement took place in September 2003, awarding approximately \$60 million to 294 agencies in all 50 states plus the District of Columbia (United States Department of Justice - COPS Office, 2006). No Homeland Security Overtime Program Grants were researched as apart of the study because they pose unique characteristics different in many ways from the grants researched for this study.

Since the tragedies of 9/11, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) was created and has distributed billions of dollars in grants to not only law enforcement, but also fire departments and emergency medical services (Department of Homeland Security, 2006). The COPS Office has generally limited funding to police departments. For the purpose of this review, the focus of the grants offered will be limited to those that directly affect law enforcement agencies and operations. The DHS has offered, and continues to offer, grants with the purpose of enhancing Homeland Security and preventing terrorist attacks in and on Americans. Arguably, one of the more popular grants is the Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI). The objective of this grant is to enhance an agency's local emergency, prevention and response ability. These objectives

also include being prepared for and having the ability to respond to threats or incidents of terrorism involving weapons of mass destruction (WMD). This program enhances selected mass transit authorities' protection of critical infrastructure and emergency preparedness activities. Funds provided under this grant are designed to address the unique needs of large urban areas and mass transit authorities. Grant funds can be expended on equipment, training, exercises and planning. While no UASI Grants were reviewed, research could be conducted using a similar model found in this study.

Metropolitan areas (urban) must submit a valid jurisdictional assessment and Urban Area Homeland Security Strategy to the Office of Domestic Preparedness (ODP) and apply online using the Department of Justice (DOJ) Office of Justice Programs (OJP) Grants Management System (GMS). According to the United States Department of Homeland Security (2005) "funding for the UASI Program is determined by a formula using a combination of current threat estimates, critical assets within the urban area, and population density. States that contain the selected cities will be notified of their eligibility to apply for this grant. At least 80 percent of all urban area funding provided through the UASI program must be obligated by the state to the designated urban area within 60 days after the receipt of funds (Department of Homeland Security, 2005)."

The Objective of the Emergency Management Performance Grants (EMPG) are to assist in the development, maintenance, and improvement of state and local emergency management capabilities. These capabilities are key components of a comprehensive national emergency management system for disasters and emergencies

that are caused by nature, are accidental, or man-made. The DHS is providing states the ability to allocate funds accordingly based on risk and the need to address the most urgent state and local needs in disaster mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery (Department of Homeland Security, 2006). Working within the standard federal government grant administration process, the EMPG provides the financial support state and local governments need to achieve measurable results in key functional areas of emergency management. These include:

- Laws and Authorities
- Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment
- Hazard Management
- Resource Management
- Planning
- Direction, Control, and Coordination
- Communications and Warning
- Operations and Procedures
- Logistics and Facilities
- Training
- Exercises
- Public Education and Information; and
- Finance and Administration (Department of Homeland Security, 2006).

Emergency Management Performance Grants funds may be used for necessary and essential expenses involved in the development, maintenance, and improvement of state and local emergency management programs. All states are eligible to apply (including the District of Columbia and territories and possessions of the United States). Local government entities are not eligible to apply directly to DHS (United States Department of Justice, 2005).

Another grant offered by the DHS is the Homeland Security Grant Program.

The objective of this grant is to enhance the capacity of state and local emergency responders to prevent, respond to, and recover from a weapons of mass destruction (WMD) terrorism incident involving chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, and explosive (CBRNE) devices and cyber attacks. This grant was competitive, and having access to the information and model contained in this study may have assisted a law enforcement agency in enhancing its application. The Homeland Security Grant program integrated into one project the following programs: State Homeland Security Program (SHSP), Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program (LETPP) and the Citizen Corps Program (CCP). SHSP funds were awarded in an effort to:

- Enhance Homeland Security and emergency operations planning
- Provide for the purchase of specialized equipment to enhance the capability of state and local agencies to prevent, respond to, and mitigate incidents of terrorism involving the use of CBRNE weapons and cyber attacks
- For costs related to the design, development, and conduct of a state CBRNE and cyber security training programs and attendance at CBRNE training courses
- For costs related to the design, development, conduct, and evaluation of CBRNE and cyber security exercises
- For costs associated with implementing State Homeland Security Assessments and Strategies (SHSAS) (Department of Homeland Security, 2006).

Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program funds were awarded to support law enforcement terrorism prevention activities through planning, organization, training, exercises, and equipment. Citizen Corps Program funds were used to support Citizen Corps Councils with planning, outreach, and management of programs and activities (Department of Homeland Security, 2005).

2.9 Citizen Corps Grant

The grants offered by the Department of Homeland Security appear on the surface to lack Community Oriented Policing practices and philosophies. However, local, county, and state law enforcement agencies can use the money to support these practices while still obtaining the goals of Homeland Security. One grant that clearly accomplishes both goals is the Citizen Corps Grant.

The mission of Citizen Corps is: “To harness the power of every individual through education, training, and volunteer service to make communities safer, stronger, and better prepared to respond to the threats of terrorism, crime, public health issues, and disasters of all kinds” (Citizen Corps, 2006). “The Citizen Corps mission is accomplished through a national network of state, local, and tribal Citizen Corps Councils. These councils build on community strengths to implement the Citizen Corps programs and carry out a local strategy to have every American participate (Citizen Corps, 2006). There are:

- 55 State/Territory Citizen Corps Councils; and
- 1,722 County/Local/Tribal Citizen Corps Councils
- 192,805,986 people or 67 % of the total US population who are served.

The purpose of Citizen Corps is to supplement and assist state and local communities to establish and / or expand Citizen Corps groups. This includes Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) training, establishing Citizen Corps Councils and supporting the oversight and outreach responsibilities of the councils. The program supports and promotes efforts to involve a wide range of volunteer groups in activities that enhance individual, community, and family preparedness and contribute

to the strengthening of Homeland Security. Citizen Corps funds currently available must be used for activities in accordance with Citizen Corps guidelines and approved by each state's designated point of contact. Recipients of the grants are expected to develop a jurisdiction-wide strategic plan to implement and sustain Citizen Corps initiatives and plans. Seventy-five percent of all funds in this grant must be passed through to local government entities. Once awarded, grant funds for Citizen Corps Council can be utilized for organizing activities, training, equipping, and maintaining CERTs; for defraying the added expense of liability coverage for CERT participants; and for outreach and public education campaigns to promote Citizen Corps and community and family safety measures, which include printing, marketing, advertising, and special events (Citizen Corps, 2006). The Citizens Corp is divided into four sections. They are the Community Emergency Response Team, Fire Corps, Neighborhood Watch Program, and Medical Reserve Corps.

“The Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) Program educates people about disaster preparedness and trains them in basic disaster response skills, such as fire safety, light search and rescue, and disaster medical operations. Using their training, CERT members can assist others in their neighborhoods or workplaces following an event and can take a more active role in preparing their communities. The program is administered by DHS” (Citizen Corps, 2006).

“An expanded Neighborhood Watch Program (NWP) incorporates terrorism awareness education into its existing crime prevention mission, while also serving as a way to bring residents together to focus on emergency preparedness and emergency

response training. Funded by DOJ, Neighborhood Watch is administered by the National Sheriffs' Association” (Citizen Corps, 2006).

“The Medical Reserve Corps (MRC) Program strengthens communities by helping medical, public health and other volunteers offer their expertise throughout the year as well as during local emergencies and other times of community need. MRC volunteers work in coordination with existing local emergency response programs and also supplement existing community public health initiatives, such as outreach and prevention, immunization programs, blood drives, case management, care planning, and other efforts. The MRC program is administered by the Department of Health and Human Services” (Citizen Corps, 2006). Individual agencies made application for this grant. The use of a model that indicates patterns commonly found in awarded grant may have assisted agencies in submitting a better application.

Individual states are eligible to apply for the assistance under this grant program. For purposes of this program and consistent with the Stafford Act, 42 U.S.C. 5122(4), “state means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.” Local governments may receive assistance as sub-grantees to the states in which they are located. The term “local government” as used in this program has the meaning set forth in the Stafford Act, 42 U.S.C. 5122(6), and includes any county, city, village, town, district, or other political subdivision of any State, any Indian tribe or authorized tribal organization, or Alaska Native village or organization, including any rural community, unincorporated town or village or any other public

entity for which an application for assistance is made by a state or political subdivision thereof.

2.10 Alternative Funding Sources

The United States Department of Justice is not the only source of grant funding for departments. Generally, each state has a department that is responsible for funding law enforcement grants for a variety of projects. In Texas, the Office of the Governor, Criminal Justice Division (CJD) is responsible for this function. The CJD offers a variety of grants that can enhance both Community Oriented Policing and Homeland Security initiatives. The grant applications are similar to the federal system in that they are competitive and scored. Grants that are written or modeled after awarded grants may score better than grants that are considered outside the norm. “The Governor's Criminal Justice Division (CJD) administers federal and state funding to local, regional and statewide criminal justice-related projects. The Criminal Justice Division's goals are to support programs that protect people from crime, reduce the number of crimes committed, and promote accountability, efficiency, and effectiveness for the criminal justice system. Resources are focused on projects that enhance Texas' capacity to prevent crimes, provide service and treatment options, enforce laws, train staff and volunteers, and serve crime victims” (State of Texas, Criminal Justice Division, 2005).

The Criminal Justice Division administers grants from a variety of state and federal funding sources. Although each funding source has its unique purpose, all CJD

grant programs share two core values: encourage innovative solutions and provide for local control. Adhering to these values allows CJD to respond to the specific needs of Texas' communities (State of Texas, Criminal Justice Division, 2005). If a model was implemented similar to the one in this study, one could determine the patterns in each of these grants. These grants are separated into five specific and unique categories.

Prevention & Juvenile Justice - Early intervention and prevention are important components in crime prevention and reduction. CJD recognizes this, and funds initiatives that target the communities' youngest. The program involves schools, families, and communities, and attempts to build meaningful relationships between children and adults. CJD's prevention projects assist with violent behavior alternatives, drug and alcohol abuse prevention, mentor programs, school safety education, after school activities (e.g., tutors, sports, arts), and gang prevention (State of Texas, Criminal Justice Division, 2005).

Juvenile Justice Projects – These projects focus on holding juvenile offenders accountable while providing meaningful intervention and rehabilitation. Juvenile justice programs incorporate substance abuse treatment, professional training and education, school resource officers, gang intervention, gender-specific programming, juvenile court assistance, drug court assistance, juvenile supervision programming, family services, and prosecution. CJD's juvenile justice research projects are designed to examine the overall juvenile justice system and make recommendations. Research in the area of disproportionate minority contact assesses the extent to which minorities are subject to different confinement decisions than non-minorities. This project includes the

development of standardized instruments assessing risk and making confinement decisions (State of Texas, Criminal Justice Division, 2005).

Law Enforcement - CJD funds a variety of grants for law enforcement programs for investigation, enforcement, prosecution, courts, substance abuse treatment, training, and technology. In light of 9/11 some law enforcement resources have been redirected toward Homeland Security initiatives, especially emergency communication systems, border security, training, and coordinated response planning (State of Texas, Criminal Justice Division, 2005).

The Statewide Texas Amber Alert Network was created through Executive Order RP16 which was signed by Governor Perry (August 12, 2002) to guarantee that all resources that are available are used to return abducted children safely to their loved ones. Executive Order RP16 states that "the network is a cooperative effort of the Office of the Governor, the Texas Department of Public Safety, the Department of Transportation, the Texas Association of Broadcasters, various business and private sector concerns, law enforcement agencies, state and local entities, and the public in the state of Texas"(State of Texas, Criminal Justice Divisions, 2005 http://www.governor.state.tx.us/divisions/cjd/index_html). The DPS coordinates the network and is authorized to activate and deactivate the network for alerts that meet specified criteria (State of Texas, Criminal Justice Division, 2005).

Texas Crime Stoppers - This program provides funds for the administration and operation of local Texas Crime Stoppers programs and the Campus Crime Stoppers programs. Texas Crime Stoppers accept anonymous tips and provides cash rewards

when these tips lead to the indictments and/or convictions of people who commit crimes. Texas Crime Stoppers provides funds for a 24-hour toll-free hotline with the purpose of gathering information on unsolved crimes. The Texas Crime Stoppers also provides grant funding directly to certified programs locally. The program provides a partnership between the public, law enforcement agencies and the media in order to speed identification and apprehension of criminals (State of Texas, Criminal Justice Division, 2005). The Crime Stoppers Programs exemplifies the true philosophies of Community Oriented Policing.

Victims' Services projects provide training to victim advocates / professionals and assists in the funding of direct services to victims. Training is also provided to peace officers, staff, and volunteers who work directly with victims of crime. Proper training of service providers increases the likelihood that victims will be treated appropriately and their needs identified immediately. CJD funds provide direct services to victims of domestic violence, family violence, drunk driving, and sexual assault. Direct services include outreach, advocacy, crisis centers and shelters. Texas Court Appointed Special Advocates (TXCASA) provides advocacy and support for child witnesses and victims experiencing the criminal justice system. The Texas chapter of Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD) promotes prevention and awareness through media campaigns and training local chapters (State of Texas, Criminal Justice Division, 2005).

While this review provides a general description of Community Oriented Policing and Homeland Security, it is not inclusive of all funding sources. Additionally,

various federal, state and private foundations provide assistance to law enforcement for a multitude of Community Oriented Policing programs, Homeland Security projects and a combination of the two.

The future of the United States Department of Justice – Community Oriented Policing Services Office and the Department of Homeland Security is not known. Grants, and the requirements associated them, change depending on the leadership of the country or in response to national needs. It is arguable that grants will not become easier; rather every indication suggests that their competitiveness will continue to increase. Should this be the case, then the emphasis to submit the highest quality application is heightened. Using a model based on standards, content and commonalities in awarded grants can assist writers, whether they are in law enforcement, education or affiliated with other community nonprofit or social services organizations, with the instructions necessary to successfully compete and receive the funding requested. Additionally, understanding how to conduct research, where to find what grants are available and understanding the goals associated with a specific grant proposal will enhance a writer's success ratio. The data can then be analyzed to determine patterns, or lack of patterns found, similar to this study.

In chapter 3 the reader will examine the methodology used to develop a model and complete this study.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

It is apparent that the United States Departments of Justice (USDOJ) and Homeland Security (DHS) are two major funding sources of grants for law enforcement agencies nationwide. According to the USDOJ Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) Office, more than \$11.3 billion has been invested in law enforcement grants since its inception in 1994. In 2004 and 2005, the DHS provided grants totaling nearly \$5 billion, which funded Homeland Security efforts including law enforcement.

The initial process of this study involved making an application to the Office of Research Compliance – Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Texas - Arlington. Once approval was received from the IRB, research began on the grant. The IRB considered this study to be exempt because it did not involve the use of human subjects.

The study was constructed in both a quantitative and qualitative manner. Quantitative methods included, but were not limited to, the frequency in which key philosophies were written in grants along with the number of grants keywords were found. Additional quantitative analysis included examining the money awarded to agencies based on multiple factors. The qualitative aspects include, but are not limited to, the completeness of the grant application, the use of lobbyists, and in the analysis of

keywords / actions. Specifically, a content analysis on the grants reviewed was implemented.

The study focuses on 48 funded grants that were selected from a list of awarded federal grants from the USDOJ and the DHS. The grants were selected by convenience (from a posted list of awards grants on the USDOJ website), and in a manner that would provide a true cross-section representation of grants based on the requesting agencies demographics. The grants selected are from varying size agencies / entities from across the nation to insure that there was no over-representation of a certain size, community or dominance in one area of the country. The study focuses on only successfully awarded grants and covers five main grant programs. All grants in the study are post 9-11-2001. The study includes successful grant applications from large cities such as Los Angeles, California and New York City, New York and grants from smaller communities such as Socorro, Texas and Sherwood, Oregon. A selection of grants from varying states and cities across the nation and from jurisdictions that vary in size to insure an accurate cross-representation of all grants, not just grants from large cities or from only one part of the nation.

The sample size in this study of 48 federal grants exceeds the minimum standards set forth by Jacob Cohen and power sampling (Keppel, G., Saufley, W., & Tokunaga, H., 2003). According to Cohen, with a power of .80 a confidence interval of .05 a person needs a minimum sample size of 44 (Keppel, G., Saufley, W., & Tokunaga, H., 2003).

The grants were obtained through the Freedom of Information Act and utilized open-records requests. The USDOJ does not publish a list of non-awarded agencies. The study focused on determining what commonalities these grants have. These commonalities include key philosophies (Community Oriented Policing, Homeland Security and Terrorism), use of important keywords, frequency of particular words, financial considerations involving population and size of jurisdictions, and the use of lobbyist. These commonalities when placed together form clearly defined patterns. The study also determined if differences exist between personnel grants and equipment and whether the jurisdiction receiving the grant is a small community (less than 100,000 residents), a medium-sized jurisdiction (between 100,000 and 350,000 residents) and large jurisdictions (more than 350,000 residents). The data retrieved from the review of the grants are displayed in tables and models. The objective of the study was to determine what patterns developed among grants that are awarded.

This type of evaluation has some inherent weaknesses. One weakness in the process was evaluating only awarded grants with no consideration as to why other grants were not chosen. Another weakness was that each grant application varied by type of grant, focus of grant, year of the grant, and by the issuing agency. Lastly, most score sheets utilized by federal grantor agencies are considered internal documents and are not subject to open record request. This eliminates an applicant from seeing exactly what they are being scored on. The score sheets were not available for analysis.

To evaluate these 48 grants, an instrument was created to extract key information from each grant. The model appears to be one-of-a-kind as no other similar

models or instruments were found in existing literature. The creation of the instrument was necessary to insure equal measuring among the grants and to fully document the findings. The creation of the instrument also serves as a model to other grant writers and educators and can easily be adapted to extract information from most grants. This information was compiled and analyzed using Microsoft Excel. The findings are shown in Chapter 4 – Findings. Appendix 1 is a blank copy of the instrument used to collect the data from each grant. The instrument was validated and altered as needed prior to its implementation.

The first section of the instrument focuses on factual information about the size of the agency requesting funds, the size of jurisdiction being served by the agency and the amount of funds being requested / matched by the agency. It is important to gather demographic information early. This allowed for analysis and subdividing grants by type and jurisdiction size. The amount requested by the agency was analyzed to determine the average dollar provided per resident, per square mile of jurisdiction and per authorized sworn officer. The mean is also indicated in the study. The first section also examines if the agency lobbied for funds, whether the applicant was a multi-jurisdictional / regional / statewide agency or a sole entity and whether the application used current and relevant statistics.

The second section of this instrument focuses on the use of keywords. The applications were analyzed to determine what keywords continually were used in the applications. While the frequency of the words in this section was not collected, the number of applications that keywords were used was collected. These data are further

analyzed by whether the applicant agency was considered small, medium or large. This will indicate which keywords are used most often in the grants.

The third section of this instrument is the use of key philosophies. A philosophy, as defined by the American Heritage Dictionary is, “the critical analysis of fundamental assumptions or beliefs; A system of values by which one lives.” Each grant was analyzed to determine if the applicant agencies demonstrated one of six selected law enforcement philosophies. The simple use of a keyword did not demonstrate the values by which the agency “lived.” The application had to indicate that the philosophies were embraced by the agency and was a normal part of its operating procedure. This data examines the use of philosophies to obtain grants and is analyzed by whether the applicant agency was considered small, medium or large. This indicated which key philosophies are used most often in the grants.

The last section of the instrument examines the frequency in which selected keywords or actions relating to keywords are used in the applicant’s grant application. Three major keywords or actions were selected for analysis. These three words / actions include Homeland Security, Terrorism and Community Oriented Policing. These words and actions were the most used terms / actions in the grants reviewed and are common place terms in law enforcement. This data was analyzed to determine if there is a correlation between the common use of the terms or actions among awarded grants. The study also examined the use of philosophies to obtain grants and is analyzed by whether the applicant agency was considered small, medium or large.

The data from the instruments were compiled in a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet to allow for analysis. Limited data analysis was compiled without the use of a computer. Two applications do not appear to be complete and were received in that condition from the USDOJ. Only limited data could be obtained from these applications.

3.1 Federal Grants Reviewed

Universal Hiring Program - 2005

Glendale, AZ

Universal Hiring Program - 2004

Lake of the Hills, IL Beacon Falls, CT Boise, ID
Sherwood, OR

Universal Hiring Program - 2003

Los Angeles, CA Hartford, CT Alabama Dept. of Public Safety
Ft. Myers, FL Clive, Iowa Omaha, NE
Socorro, TX

COPS Making Officer Redeployment Effective - 2001

Alaska State Police Hope, AR Bakersfield, CA
Denver, CO Brevard Co., FL Londonderry, NH

COPS Making Officer Redeployment Effective - 2002

Pasadena, CA DeKalb, GA Coffeyville, KS
Kalamazoo DPS, MI Federal Way, WA

Secure our Schools -2005

Riverside, CA El Paso Co., CO Pocatello, ID
Rapides Parish, LA Raleigh, NC Desoto, TX

Interoperability - 2005

Phoenix, AZ Cheyenne, WY New York, NY
Eugene, OR

Interoperabilty - 2004

Shreveport, LA Warren, MI Charolette - Mecklenburg, NC

Cops In Schools - 2004

Tyler County, WV Orange CO., VT Kennedale, TX
Tulsa, OK San Francisco, CA Pima County, AZ

Cops In Schools - 2005

Revere, MA Independence, MO Poteau, OK
Springettsbury, PN Fairfax Co., VA Brandon, SD

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

The study focused on 48 federally funded grants. The grants were analyzed as a group, and then subsequently divided into categories for further analysis. The grants were divided into sub-categories depending on whether the grant was a personnel (hiring) grant or equipment only grant. The grants were divided within the sub-groups by population of jurisdiction served (cities less than 100,000 residents, cities 100,000 – 350,000 and cities of 350,000 or more residents). The division of grants allows for an accurate and thorough analysis of data.

The 48 grants were divided into personnel grants and equipment grants, both having 24 grants. The grants were also divided into small (22), medium (13) and large cities (13) grants.

Table 4.1 – Grants By Type And Size of Jurisdiction

Grant Type	Small	Medium	Large
Personnel (24)	13	5	6
Equipment (24)	9	8	7

4.1 Grant Analysis – All Grants

The first finding examined the average dollar awarded by the federal government in relationship to the authorized sworn force of the applicant agency. The average of all grants was \$5,020.76 per authorized sworn position and the median was \$2,438.66. The next finding determined that the average federal grant award per resident served was \$5.96 with a median of \$3.47. Of the 48 grants, 12 had awards of

less than \$1.00 per resident served, 17 had awards of between \$1.01 and \$5.00, nine had awards between \$5.01 and \$10.00, and ten grants were awarded with funding of more than \$10.00 per resident served. The span of award was from \$0.19 to more than \$41.00 per resident served, however 38 grants (79%) were funded at under \$10.00 per resident served. The third finding determined the average amount of money awarded to a jurisdiction based square mileage. The average was \$12,085.02. However, unlike the average dollar amount per sworn officer and per resident, the award amount per square mile varied greatly. The highest award per square mile was more than \$86,000 per square mile while the lowest was \$0.18. There appears to be no correlation between the square miles a jurisdiction serves and the amount awarded to the jurisdiction. This was consistent when analyzing all the sub-groups. The large range of dollar amounts is not surprising when one considers the expansive nature of rural counties and the congestion associated with some major cities. This data are further extrapolated into personnel grants and equipment grants.

The study examined the amount of federal grant awards in comparison to the number of authorized sworn positions. The average federal grant awarded per sworn officer for personnel grants was \$7,730.55 and \$1,769.00 for equipment grants. The study also examined the amount of federal grant awards in comparison to the number of residents served in a particular jurisdiction. The average federal dollar amount awarded per resident served for a personnel grant was \$9.00 and an equipment grant was \$2.93. The next section of analysis focused on the use of keywords.

Each of the 48 grants was analyzed for common words and they were recorded.

The use of keywords and the number of grants they are used in is shown in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2 – Keywords / Action Frequency

Keyword / Action	Number of Grants	Keyword / Action	Number of Grants
Community Oriented Policing	34	Population Growth	13
Regional / Collaboration	31	Sharing Crime Data	15
Quality of Service	15	Interoperability	8
Enhance Security / Lower Crime	31	Terrorism	17
Decreased Police Budget	7	Task Force	3
Gangs / At Risk Youth	8	Efficiency	21
Homeland Security	21	Technology	22
Financially Desperate	27	Narcotics Use	7
Crime Rate / UCR	12	Operational Plans	28

The most commonly used term was Community Oriented Policing. It was found in 70.8% of all grants. This indicates that regardless of the purpose of the grant (personnel or equipment) the term Community Oriented Policing was widely used. It is also important to note that Regional / Collaboration and Enhanced Security / Lower Crime are mentioned in 31 of the 48 grants or 64.6% of the grants reviewed. This also indicates that these terms were utilized regardless of type of grant or size of agency. Less frequent words such as Task Force appeared to have little correlation among awarded grants. On average, there are 6.81 keys words used per grant (6.52 for personnel grants and 7.08 for equipment grants). Of the 18 keywords reviewed, five of them were mentioned in more than 50% of the grants reviewed.

The next section of the analysis examined the use of key philosophies in the grant applications. There were six initial philosophies possible. Each grant was required to demonstrate that it had incorporated the philosophy into its operation rather than just

mentioning a keyword in a narrative. Table 3 indicates the use of these six philosophies in the 48 grants that were studied.

Table 4.3 – Use of Philosophies

Philosophy	All Grants	Personnel Grants	Equipment Grants
Community Oriented Policing	37	22	15
Homeland Security	21	11	10
Terrorism	18	10	8
Regional / Collaboration	20	8	12
Gangs / At Risk Youth	9	6	3
Interoperability	8	0	8

Community Oriented Policing philosophies were noted in 37 of the 48 grants (77%). Unlike the keyword section, the philosophies mentioned may be an action relating to the philosophy rather than the actual keywords listed. Community Oriented Policing philosophies are found in both personnel grants and in equipment grants regardless of the size of the applicant agency or the jurisdiction it serves. Homeland Security philosophies are mentioned in 21 of the 48 grants (44%). It was apparent that the philosophies researched were basically consistent between the types of grant with the exception of Interoperability grants which focus only on equipment only. The last section of the study examined the frequency of three major keywords and actions as they were used in the 48 grants examined.

The frequency of keywords used in grants is shown in Table 4.4. The keywords / actions looked at the major themes prevalent in the grants examined and in law enforcement terminology and included Homeland Security, Terrorism and Community Oriented Policing. (Note: Two grants were incomplete)

Table 4.4 – Frequency of Terms – All Grants

Frequency of Terms - All Grants	0	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26+	Total
Homeland Security	23	14	5	2	0	1	1	46
Terrorism	26	8	3	0	5	0	4	46
Community Oriented Policing	9	4	6	3	1	3	20	46

It is apparent the most frequently used term or action is Community Oriented Policing. In 20 of the 48 grants, Community Oriented Policing or actions relating to it were mentioned more than 26 times. Community Oriented Policing was not mentioned in only nine grants (18.8%). It should be noted that frequency of Homeland Security and Terrorism (or related actions) was only mentioned in 50% or less of the total grants.

4.2 Grant Analysis – By Size of Jurisdiction

In total there were 22 grants analyzed from smaller jurisdictions (less than 100,000 residents) and 13 each from medium (100,000 – 350,000 residents) and large (more than 350,000 residents) jurisdictions. Table 4.5 illustrates the differences between the size of jurisdictions using all grants (personnel and equipment). Table 4.6 illustrates differences between jurisdiction sizes in when only comparing personnel grants. Lastly, table 4.7 illustrates the differences between the size of jurisdictions of only equipment grants. The comparisons in tables 4.5, 4.6 and 4.7 examine the average federal grant amount per authorized sworn officer and per resident served in dollars by

type of grant and size of jurisdiction. The tables also show the average number of keywords used and the average philosophies used.

Table 4.5 – Average of All Grants

All Grants	Small	Medium	Large
Average Dollar Awarded per Authorized Sworn	\$7,856.62	\$2,707.67	\$2,130.21
Average Dollar Awarded per Resident Served	\$8.92	\$4.39	\$2.53
Average of Total Keywords Used	6.14	7.00	7.83
Average of Total Philosophies Used	2.05	2.46	3.00

Table 4.6 – Average of Personnel Grants

Personnel Grants	Small	Medium	Large
Average Dollar Awarded per Authorized Sworn	\$11,758.83	\$2,707.67	\$2,992.96
Average Dollar Awarded per Resident Served	\$12.86	\$5.47	\$3.57
Average of Total Keywords Used	5.54	6.80	8.80
Average of Total Philosophies Used	2.08	2.80	3.20

Table 4.7 – Average of Equipment Grants

Equipment Grants	Small	Medium	Large
Average Dollar Awarded per Authorized Sworn	\$1,515.53	\$2,540.18	\$1,094.90
Average Dollar Awarded per Resident Served	\$3.23	\$3.72	\$1.64
Average of Total Keywords Used	7.00	7.13	7.14
Average of Total Philosophies Used	2.00	2.25	2.86

The average amount granted by the federal government per sworn officer is the highest among small size jurisdictions at \$7,856.62 (Table 4.5). The average dollar amount awarded per resident served is \$8.92, also the highest among small, medium and large jurisdictions (Table 4.5). Other findings show that smaller jurisdictions have the lowest total keyword usage at 6.14 and the least average number of philosophies utilized averaging 2.05 per grant.

When these data are broken down by grant type, personnel grants averaged \$11,758.83 per sworn officers and \$12.86 per resident served; smaller jurisdictions had the highest dollar amount (Table 4.6). Small jurisdictions awarded personnel grants had

the least number of keywords and philosophies used while large cities had the most (Table 4.6). Equipment grants indicated that medium sized jurisdictions had the highest dollar amount per sworn officer at \$2,540.18 with large jurisdictions having the lowest (Table 4.7). Large jurisdictions had the lowest awards per resident served at \$1.64, nearly 50% less than small jurisdictions (Table 4.7).

Tables 4.8, 4.9 and 4.10 indicate the frequency of key philosophy usage by jurisdiction size.

Table 4.8 – Frequency of Terms - Small Jurisdictions

Frequency of Terms - Small Jurisdictions	0	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26+	Total
Homeland Security	12	7	1	1	0	0	0	21
Terrorism	14	3	2	0	2	0	0	21
Community Oriented Policing	2	3	3	0	1	2	10	21

(*missing one application)

Table 4.9 – Frequency of Terms - Medium Jurisdictions

Frequency of Terms – Medium Jurisdictions	0	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26+	Total
Homeland Security	7	4	1	1	0	0	0	13
Terrorism	6	3	1	0	2	0	1	13
Community Oriented Policing	3	0	3	1	0	1	5	13

Table 4.10 – Frequency of Terms - Large Jurisdictions

Frequency of Terms – Large Jurisdictions	0	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26+	Total
Homeland Security	4	3	3	0	0	1	1	12
Terrorism	5	3	0	0	1	0	3	12
Community Oriented Policing	4	1	0	2	0	0	5	12

(*missing one application)

4.3 Grant Analysis – Additional Findings

Additional factors were considered when analyzing these data. Of the 48 grants researched only two (4%) of the applicants indicated that they utilized lobbyists to assist in securing their grants. There appears to be no advantages to lobbying for a grant. Each grant reviewed allowed or required the applying agencies to match federal funds. In total, 16 of the 48 grants (33%) offered a larger match than required by the grant. Only three applicants applied and requested waivers of matching funds due to financial hardships. Another finding examined if the applicant was a statewide agency, a multi-jurisdictional or regional agencies / partnerships. All the interoperability grants were multi-jurisdictional or regional projects and accounted for seven of the 11 grants that indicated more than one agency was involved. The Cops in Schools Grant also require partnerships with the local school district(s). The last area researched was whether the applicant agencies used relevant and current statistics such as crime rate, calls for service, arrest rates, UCR data, or other factual statistics. Of the 46 grants that were completed, 23 (50%) used current and relevant statistics.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

There is no secret word, phrase, dollar amount or system to authoring the perfect grant. However, it was apparent that there were some commonalities among awarded federal grants. The study of these 48 grants has provided a broad guide or model that is designed to help law enforcement write more effective grants, or at least assist them by making law enforcement agencies aware of what common themes are prevalent in prior awarded grants. The study also explored the costs associated with federal grants in relationship to the number of residents served by the jurisdiction, the number of sworn officer positions authorized and the average cost per square mile of jurisdiction. The use of a single finding, or a combination of multiple findings from this study could assist law enforcement agencies in their future efforts to obtain federal grants by understanding the keywords and other data that is most important to evaluators. In addition to writing techniques and having an awareness of the types of grants available, grant writers must stay within the limits of the grant or risk not being funded. This study does not guarantee that any entity using the findings of this study will receive funding of a specific grant, but it does provide analysis of grants that were awarded and many of the commonalities in those grants.

The majority of grants used Community Oriented Policing terms and philosophies regardless of the purpose of the grant. The use of Community Oriented

Policing or actions relating to community policing in grants that were from the DHS indicated that this terminology has become intermingled with Terrorism and Homeland Security efforts. New Homeland Security efforts undertaken by some jurisdictions include the identification of potential terrorist sites, such as municipal water pump stations and electrical grids. Additional actions to provide protection and enhance security at these locations both by physical barriers (locks, gates, and barb-wire) and non-physical means such as “special watches” for patrol officers. This is nothing more than a Community Oriented Policing (or Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) action with a different label. The mention of Community Oriented Policing as keywords and as philosophies in a broad spectrum of grants indicates that the viewpoint is widely accepted and in action across the nation. The use of keywords suggests that terms such as Community Oriented Policing, Terrorism and Homeland Security are common parts of awarded grants. There are an average of more than six keywords noted in the grants and as high as 11 keywords were found in one grant. The use of keywords was seen in all awarded grants with the majority (38 or 79%) using between five and nine keywords per grant. Of those analyzed, there were only four grants that used four keywords or less and only four grants that used more than ten keywords per grant.

In addition, the findings of this study suggest that there is some emphasis that evaluators placed on the need to spend money wisely. The study showed that 38 of the 48 (79%) federally funded grants had awards of \$10.00 or less per resident regardless of the type of grant or the size of jurisdiction applying for the grant. The cost per person served must be on the minds of the Department of Justice and it will benefit the

applicant agency to be cognizant of this dollar amount. An applicant agency that proposes spending a higher dollar amount per resident to accomplish a goal may lessen their chances of being awarded a grant if the same project can be provided to residents for less money per resident in a different jurisdiction. This same consideration should be made per sworn authorized position. However, there should be little or no consideration of the amount of money per square mile of the jurisdiction. The study indicated that the population density varied greatly among jurisdictions. For example, a very large rural county may cover 1,000 square miles yet serves only 20,000 residents, while another jurisdiction may have 100,000 residents in a 20 square mile area. The cost per square mile formula varies too greatly and thus is an unreliable formula and source of comparison.

Another area researched examined the likelihood that an agency providing funds greater than required would enhance the possibility of receiving funding. Hiring grants such as the Universal Hiring Program (UHP) pro-rate the amount they fund an agency over three years. Other hiring grants, such as the Cops in Schools grants fund a flat award not to exceed \$125,000 for three years. Any additional funding must be supplemented by the applicant. Equipment grants generally have between a 25% and 50% match. While one-third (16) provided additional funds beyond what was required, it is not mandatory to do this to secure a grant. However, by providing additional funds that are more than what is required, an agency may have a competitive edge in receiving a grant because it demonstrates a higher than required commitment to the success of the program. The addition of more funds does not guarantee success of the program or of

winning the grant. Another area examined the use of current and relevant statistics. The use of current data was found in 23 of 46 funded grants (50%) funded, a significant number (two grants were missing this data).

The study also showed that only two of the 48 grants reviewed had agencies that utilized lobbyists. The use of a lobbyist may help an agency receive funding, but there was little data to indicate that lobbying activities greatly improved the likelihood that a grant would receive funding. A lobbyist works to “earmark” funding for a particular agency for a specific project. Projects may include equipment and personnel grants. Lobbyists are generally utilized by large agencies due to the cost associated with their services. The hiring of a lobbyist does not guarantee or greatly enhance an agency’s chance for a grant award.

The trend of regional collaboration between various law enforcement agencies (such as a task force) or between law enforcement agencies and community service provider such as a school district, district attorney’s office, or a victim service provider appears to be important in some grants such as Radio Interoperability, Cops MORE and Cops in Schools. Without establishing partnerships, these grants may not have received funding. In total there were 31 grants that used regional / collaboration as keywords and 20 as a philosophy. Of the 31 keywords 17 were in personnel grants and 14 were in equipment grants. Of the 20 grants in which regional / collaboration was a philosophy eight were personnel grants and 12 were equipment grants. It should be noted that the personnel grants such as the Cops in Schools program must have collaboration with the school district in order to receive funding. Equipment grants such as Radio

Interoperability were submitted as a regional improvement plan. The partnership between law enforcement agencies in particular regions strengthens the likelihood that grants will succeed, especially with the reallocation of federal dollars in a post 9/11 era. Additionally, regionalizing grants were generally more cost effective and has lower administrative costs associated them. The savings can then be passed on to those being served as a lower cost per resident / or more residents being served for the same cost.

It is doubtful that any single aspect of the study will in itself be a deciding factor as to whether a grant is funded by the government. However, given the totality of the research and the many facets, the incorporation of principles proposed in the study will assist agencies in knowing keywords and factors that were present in successful grant proposals. Modeling new grant applications in a similar fashion or style can increase inexperienced grant writers success and make the preparation of the grant easier for the writer. The lack of commonalities to previously funded grants charts new waters that are unproven and may result in low scores and no funding. It is recommended that law enforcement grant writers use the data presented in this study to model future grant applications. In addition, the grant writer should research additional grants within the category that is closest to the desired grant that is being written. As an example, an agency wishing to author a personnel grant would benefit from researching prior personnel grants that were awarded. A similar analysis using like tables and methods should be conducted by any law enforcement prior to submitting their application. When the applicant's grant is patterned after previously awarded grants, it increases the likelihood that it will be funded.

The commonalities and patterns among winning grants is evident. Likewise, the data also indicated information that appears to have little or no pattern. This data should not be avoided by the grant writer because it is only an indicator that no pattern existed. In a more competitive environment with fewer dollars available, it is important that grant writers use all information at their disposal in order to submit the most compelling application. By being familiar with the types of grants available, the amount of dollars they have provided in the past and have access to in the future, the key components of successful grants (key words and philosophies), a writer increases his/her chance for success. The correlation between certain aspects in grants and the grants awarded can not be overlooked. Incorporating and demonstrating that the agency participates in law enforcement philosophies such as Community Oriented Policing, Homeland Security, and regional collaboration is paramount.

The readers and evaluators of a grant application have also place emphasis on the fact that the applicant agency should be using up-to-date terms and practices and demonstrates a mastery of the topic presented. This confidence will increase their chances to score well. Similarly, the applicant agency may be cognizant of financial expense. The study clearly shows how much money the majority of grant applications applied for per resident and per authorized sworn. It will be beneficial to an applicant to design their proposed grant projects to fit within the normal ranges. Exceptions may be made that exceed the normal ranges, but it was clearly evident that this was the exception and not the standard. If an applicant chooses to deviate from the norm, they need to explicitly explain why.

The study of the grant and the data that is presented is not limited to uses at a police department or sheriff's office. Criminal justice educators and universities now have a model to present to their students. The events of 9/11 have changed how grants are awarded and what priorities are paramount to federal government. This study can be presented in an educational setting so that future criminal justice students have a model by which future grants can be authored. While the future grants may vary in funding different projects, the principles behind this study are fluid and easily adaptable to researching most grants. Lastly, this study allows criminal justice students and / or practitioners the opportunity to expand the data set by incorporating more categories or grants.

The model design can also be utilized outside the criminal justice community in such areas as social services or healthcare. Educators in these disciplines often offer grant courses in which this research would be germane. The design of a model could assist future grant writers by providing an instrument by which a writer could pattern his/her application after previously awarded grants is not exclusive to the criminal justice / law enforcement grants. For instance, social services and healthcare providers should have similar funding that is similar in structure and competitiveness to criminal justice grants. Many nonprofit foundations could utilize the model developed in this study to assist their member organizations in securing both government and private fund grants. Constant variables may include dollar amounts per person served, keyword usage and demonstrating that the agency is proficient in applicable management philosophies. These ideologies are boundless.

The study presented has found distinct patterns in several areas of different federal grants from a cross-section of law enforcement agencies nationwide. The study, if used properly, can serve as a model for future grant writers in pursuit of new grants. It is evident that the competition among police agencies to obtain grants is increasing. More grant applicants and decreased federal funds means that law enforcement agencies cannot lack in their quest of funds. When scoring grants a tenth of a point can be the difference between receiving an award announcement or receiving a decline notice. The data found as a result of the study will assist law enforcement grant writers in improving their grants and insuring that they are similar to previously awarded grants. Each grant that is secured by an agency benefits the jurisdiction's governing body (and its entities), its residents, and the quality of life in the region. Law enforcement agencies that need this money the most are oftentimes the most financially desperate and lack the ability to retain qualified grant writers. This study allows all law enforcement agencies equal access to the patterns researched in this report. Hopefully, the data presented here will assist law enforcement agencies who have not applied for grants, or who have been unsuccessful in their attempts to write winning grants, succeed by modeling their grants after successful awarded grants, and thus receive an award announcement from the grantor.

APPENDIX A

FEDERAL GRANT INSTRUMENT

Federal Grant Instrument

Grant _____ Personnel _____ Equipment Only _____
Federal Dollar Amount Requested _____ %
Match Dollar Amount Required _____ %
Total Grant Project _____ %
More than minimum match required? Y / N Waiver of matching funds Y / N
FTE / OFC Requested _____ Authorized Sworn _____ Actual Sworn _____
Jurisdiction Served Population _____ \$ Amount per Resident _____
Square Mileage of Jurisdiction _____ \$ Amount per Square Mile _____
Lobbying Activities Y / N Application Complete Y / N
Multi-Jurisdictional / Regional / Statewide? _____ Sole entity _____
Uses Current / Relevant Statistics Y / N

Use of Keywords -

___ Community Oriented Policing	___ Homeland Security	___ Terrorism
___ Regional / Collaboration	___ Financially Desperate	___ Task Force
___ Quality of Service	___ Crime Rate / UCR	___ Efficiency
___ Enhance Security / Lower Crime	___ Population Growth	___ Technology
___ Decreased Police Budget	___ Sharing Crime Data	___ Narcotics Use
___ Gangs / At Risk Youth	___ Interoperability	___ Operational Plans

Use of Key Philosophies

___ Community Oriented Policing	___ Homeland Security	___ Terrorism
___ Regional / Collaboration	___ Gangs / At Risk Youth	___ Interoperability

Frequency of Words / Actions relating to:

Homeland Security	___ 0	___ 1-5	___ 6-10	___ 11-15	___ 16-20	___ 21-25	___ 26 +
Terrorism	___ 0	___ 1-5	___ 6-10	___ 11-15	___ 16-20	___ 21-25	___ 26 +
COP	___ 0	___ 1-5	___ 6-10	___ 11-15	___ 16-20	___ 21-25	___ 26 +

REFERENCES

- About the Training. (2002). In *Florida Regional Community Policing Institute*.
Retrieved 10-27-2006, from Florida RCPI:
<http://cop.spcollege.edu/cop/training/train.htm>
- Citizen Corps. (2005). Mission Statement. In. Retrieved July 19, 2005, from
<http://www.citizencorps.gov/councils>
- COPS History*. [Time Line of COPS Office]. (2005). Retrieved July 17, 2005, from
<http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/default.asp?Item=44>:
- Cordner, G.A. (1997). Community Policing: Elements and effects. In G.P. Alpert & A. Piquero (Eds.), *Community Policing: Contemporary readings* (pp.284-301). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.
- Department of Homeland Security. (2005). Homeland Security Grants. In *Emergencies and Disasters*. Retrieved July 17, 2005, from
http://www.dhs.gov/dhspublic/interapp/editorial/editorial_0355.xml:
- Eisinger, Peter(with Wayne State University). (September 2004). A Preliminary Assessment of the Effects of September 11. *THE AMERICAN CITY IN THE AGE OF TERROR* (pp. 115-130). Washington D.C>: Sage Publications.
- Greene, J.R. (1987). Foot patrol and community policing: Past practices and future prospects. *American Journal of Police*, 6, 1-15.

- Homeland Security, Budget-in-Brief Fiscal Year 2006.* (2006). Retrieved 10-27-2006, from Homeland Security, Budget-in-Brief Fiscal Year 2006:
http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/Budget_BIB-FY2006.pdf
- Kelling, G.L., Pate, T., Dieckman, D. & Brown, C.E. (1974). *Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment: A Technical Report.* Washington D.C.: Police Foundation.
- Kelling, G.L., Pate, T., Dieckman, D. & Brown, C.E. (2003). A Summary Report. *THE KANSAS CITY PREVENTIVE PATROL EXPERIMENT.* Washington, DC: Police Foundation. (Original work published 1974)
- Keppel, G., Saufley, W., & Tokunaga, H. (2003). A Student's Handbook. *Introduction to Design & Analysis* (Second, p. 210). New York City, New York: W.H. Freeman and Company.
- Marcuse, Peter. (September 2002). Urban form and globalization after September 11th: The view from New York. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 26, 596-606.
- Maguire, E. (1997). Structural change in large municipal police organization during the community policing era. *Justice Quarterly*, 14, 701-730.
- Monkkonen, E.H. (2006). *POLICE FORCES.* [Data File]. Houghton Mifflin.
- Patterson, J. (with Clearwater, Fl, Police Department). (November 1995). *Community Policing: Learning The Lessons Of History.* [Data File]. 'Lectric Law Library.
- Philosophy. (2006). *The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition.* Retrieved October 08, 2006, from Dictionary.com website:
<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/philosophy>

- Poinke, J. (2001). Officials secure cities but resolve to reassess terrorism plans. In *National League of Cities*. Retrieved from www.nlc.org:
- Ross, J. Grants-R-Us [Inside a Federal Grant-Making Research Agency]. (August, 2000). *American Behavioral Scientist*, 43(10).
- Roth, J., & Ryan, J. (2000)Overview. In J. Ross, J.F. Ryan, S.J. Gaffigan, C.S. Koper, M.H. Moore, J.A. Roehl, et al. (Eds.), *National evaluation of the COPS Program: Title I of the 1994 Crime Act*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- SFGate.com. (February 07, 2005). Budget Glance for Justice. In. Retrieved July 17, 2005, from <http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/news/archive/2005/02/07/national/w143732S69.DTL>:
- Sherman, L. (1973). Team Policing: Seven case studies. Washington, DC.: Police Foundation.
- Sir Robert Peel. (1829). *Wikipedia*. Retrieved October 27, 2006, from Answers.com Web site: <http://www.answers.com/topic/sir-robert-peel>
- State of Texas, Criminal Justice Division. (2005). Criminal Justice Division. In. Retrieved July 19, 2005, from <http://www.governor.state.tx.us/divisions/cjd>:
- Thayer, R.E., & Reynolds, M.K. (1997). Community Oriented Policing. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 12, 93-113.
- United States Department of Homeland Security. (2005). Fiscal Year 2006. *Budget in Brief* (p. 5). Washington D.C.: United States Department of Homeland Security.
- United States Department of Homeland Security. (July 13, 2005). In *Homeland Security Secretary Michael Chertoff Announces Six-Point Agenda for Department of*

- Homeland Security*. Retrieved July 17, 2005, from http://www.dhs.gov/dhspublic/interapp/press_release/press_release_0703.xml:
- United States Department of Homeland Security. (2006). DHS Organization. In *FAQs*. Retrieved from <http://www.dhs.gov/dhspublic/faq.jsp>:
- United States Department of Justice. (2006). Applying for COPS Funding. In. Retrieved from <http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/Default.asp?Item=65>:
- United States Department of Justice (COPS Office). (2006). What is Community Policing. In. Retrieved from <http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/Default.asp?Item=36>:
- Whitehouse.gov. (2005). In *Improving Homeland Security*. Retrieved July 17, 2005, from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/>:
- Worrall, John & Jihong Zhao. (2003). The role of the COPS Office in community policing. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 26(1), 64-87. Retrieved July 13, 2005, from <http://lysander.emeraldinsight.com/vl=2277548/cl=91/nw=1/fm=html/rpsv/cw/mcb/1363951x/v26n1/s4/p64>:
- Zhao, J., Lovrich, N., & Thurman, Q. (1999). The status if community policing in American cities: Facilitators and impediments revisited. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 22, 74-92.
- Zhao, J., Scheider, M., & Thurman, Q. (December, 2003). A national evaluation of the effects of COPS grants on police productivity (arrests) 1995-1999. *Police Quarterly*, 6 (4), 387-409.

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Mr. Kenneth A. Myers is a 12 year law enforcement veteran who has served in a variety of enforcement and administrative positions. During the past seven years he has been involved in the authoring, maintenance and reporting of various federal, state and private foundation grants.

Mr. Myers holds a Bachelor of Science degree in Criminal Justice / Criminology from the University of Texas – Arlington (1998). Mr. Myers is a Master Peace Officer (TCLEOSE), Certified Jailer (TCLEOSE), Certified Instructor (TCLEOSE), Certified Crime Prevention Specialist (TCPA), Crime Prevention Inspector (TCLEOSE), and the recipient of the Silver Star of Bravery from the National Police Hall of Fame. Mr. Myers has served as the 1st Vice President of the Texas Crime Prevention Association and is a member of the North Texas Crime Commission.

In the last five years Mr. Myers has authored more than 45 grant applications with requests totaling nearly \$4 million dollars. Due to his unique approach to authoring grants, he has been awarded more than 80% of the grants he applied for. Mr. Myers also has several grants in a “pending” status. Lastly, Mr. Myers has successfully completed several grant audits with positive outcomes.