

V i e w m e t a d a t a , c i t a t i o n C u O  
p r o v i d e d

**The Bill Blackwood  
Law Enforcement Management Institute of Texas**

---

---

**Law Enforcement Grants: A Comparison of Funded Texas Grants**

---

---

**An Administrative Research Paper  
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment  
Required for Graduation from the  
Leadership Command College**

---

---

**By  
Kenneth A. Myers**

**Allen Police Department  
Allen, Texas  
July 2008ABSTRACT**

Law enforcement grants in the State of Texas are relevant to contemporary law enforcement due to economic challenges often faced by cities and counties. The purpose of the study is to identify commonalities among State of Texas grants that have been awarded by the Office of the Governor, Criminal Justice Division. The research focuses on more than 35 grants that were awarded on or after 2002. A measurement instrument was developed and validated 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 represented a cross-section of Texas 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 acquired can be used as a model to assist them in the development of their own grant applications.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	
Introduction. . . . .	1
Review of Literature . . . . .	3
Methodology . . . . .	17
Findings . . . . .	21
Discussions/Conclusions . . . . .	27
References . . . . .	35
Appendix	

## 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 39 State of Texas law enforcement grants from the Office of The Governor, Criminal Justice Division. The grants that were reviewed and analyzed were submitted by jurisdictions of varying sizes, demographics, socioeconomics, and regions of Texas. 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 use and frequency, use of key philosophies, and financial components of the grant.

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 911 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 such as computers, software, and other equipment related to law enforcement. The terminology and purpose of grants change to reflect recent events and priorities, but 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 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 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 for law enforcement agencies. 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.

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of the study is to identify commonalities among state grants that have been awarded by the State of Texas, Office of the Governor, Criminal Justice Division. 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, identifying potential funding sources, defining commonly used grant terms, and authoring grant applications. The following section provides an overview of literature regarding 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 law enforcement grants.

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. 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, 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).

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," 2008). This statement emphasizes the epitome of

Community Oriented Policing. Peel was the first police administrator to assign officers to specific geographic areas throughout the city. According to Patterson (1995), Peel held his officers 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. Additionally, it was believed that officers would be more familiar with people and places and thus better able to recognize suspicious persons or criminal activity. Lastly, officers would be highly visible on their posts, tending to deter criminals from committing crimes in the immediate vicinity (Patterson, 1995). This is the essence of Community Policing.

These principles were adopted as American cities slowly developed police departments. 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.

By the end of the nineteenth-century, police departments became more diverse and reflected a closer representation of the demographics of the city by hiring minorities and women (Monkkonen, 2006). The philosophy of Community Oriented Policing became increasingly popular in the 1950s and 1960s 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 1960s and early 1970s and focused on efficient and effective policing, improved police/community relations, assignment of police teams, and enhanced police officer morale (Sherman, 1973). 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.

In academic literature, there are two well-known Community Oriented Policing studies which are the following: The Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment and The Newark Foot Patrol Experiment (The Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment, 1973), (The Newark Foot Patrol Experiment, 1973). 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, which was 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, then this study may not have occurred.

Another major Community Oriented Policing study funded by a grant was the Newark Foot Patrol Experiment (The Newark Foot Patrol Experiment, 1973). 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 of 1978 and ended in January of 1979. The Police Foundation found that introducing foot patrols in a mix of police strategies significantly enhanced 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 (Kelling et al., 1974), introducing foot patrols seemed to have little effect on crime rates, but it did have positive effects. These included residents that knew officers were patrolling their neighborhoods on foot and that residents believed that areas patrolled by officers on foot had less of a problem than did residents in areas with

only motorized patrol. Residents in areas patrolled by officers on foot felt safer and less likely to be victimized. Furthermore, these residents took fewer steps to protect themselves against crime, demonstrating a perception that there was less fear of crime, and were more satisfied with police services.

Residents in the areas where foot patrols were conducted had noticeable changes in their attitudes about crime, their perception of safety, and the 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 (Kelling et al., 1974). The “broken window theory” was based on the belief that failing to fix issues in the community, such as a simple broken window, can lead to the deterioration of a neighborhood over time. Similar to the Kansas City Study, one might surmise that without a law enforcement grant this study may not have occurred. Since these studies, grants have been expended by the federal government, state governments, and private foundations to conduct research and studies relating to police operations and delivery of 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). 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; therefore, it 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 of advancing 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 lived there. The COPS Office funded a wide variety of strategies to advance Community Policing through innovative techniques and technologies. The use of 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. Community Oriented Policing grants diminished greatly after the terrorist acts on 9/11, and a new emphasis was placed on funding Homeland Security initiatives rather than Community Policing.

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).

This led to a noticeable impact for local, county, and state governments with the awarding of numerous grants relating to Homeland Security and the war on terrorism rather than the traditional theories of Community Oriented Policing.

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. The law enforcement environment was transformed from a Community Oriented Policing philosophy to a protecting the nation's 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 large American cities (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 was that municipal governments took on new and costly security responsibilities in an intergovernmental environment in which the state and federal government partnerships were often perceived as both dilatory and unresponsive.

It can be argued that the world and communities throughout the nation will never be the same. Many fear that the United States would enter a state of isolationism and paranoia to the point that citizens would lock themselves in their houses and sacrifice their 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 sky-scrapers 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 began to immediately 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).

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 the nation (United States Department of Homeland Security, 2005). Secretary Chertoff stated, “Our Department must drive improvement with a sense of urgency. The nation’s enemies constantly changes and

adapts, so we as a Department must be nimble and decisive” (United States Department of Homeland Security, 2005). The Secretary’s six-point agenda will guide DHS in the near term and result in changes that will increase overall preparedness, create better transportation security systems, strengthen border security, reform immigration processes, enhance information sharing, improve DHS operations, and realign the DHS organization to maximize mission performance (United States Department of Homeland Security, 2005). 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. 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 ("Improving Homeland Security," 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 that administer grants include the Department of Health and Human Services' public health preparedness grants, the Department of Justice grants

for counter-terrorism and general-purpose law enforcement activities, and the Environmental Protection Agency grants for enhancing the security of the nation's water supplies (Department of Homeland Security, 2005). Unlike the COPS Office 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 ("Budget Glance for Justice," 2005). According to SFGate.com (2005), the COPS Office 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 ("Budget Glance for Justice", 2005). However, it appears that the Department of Homeland Security's budget continues to increase.

The President's fiscal year 2006 budget request was \$41.1 billion for the Department of Homeland Security ("Improving Homeland Security", 2006). This is an increase in total budgetary authority of 7% over the enacted fiscal year 2005 funding, excluding Project BioShield, clearly demonstrates the Administration's continued commitment to making further improvements to the nation's safety. The operating



entities with significant budgetary increases are Immigration and Customs Enforcement, up 13.5%, and the U.S. Coast Guard, which is 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% (United States Department of Homeland Security, 2005).

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 state 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) is responsible for the administration of federal pass-through funds in addition to state funds. The moneys are passed through to statewide, regional, and local criminal justice-related projects. The Criminal Justice Division's goals are to support criminal justice related programs in an effort to protect people from crime, reduce the overall number of crimes committed, and positively promote the criminal justice system. Resources are focused on projects that enhance the state's ability to prevent crimes, provide enhanced services/treatment options, enforce state and federal laws, and serve crime victims (State of Texas, 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, 2005). These grants are separated into six specific and unique categories.

The first category of grants offered by the Criminal Justice Division is Prevention and Juvenile Justice grants. These grants are geared towards early intervention and prevention and are important components in crime prevention and reduction. CJD's prevention projects assist with violent behavior alternatives; drug and alcohol abuse prevention; mentor programs; school safety education; after school activities like tutors, sports, arts; and gang prevention (State of Texas, 2005). The next category of grants offered is 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 (State of Texas, 2005). The state also offers grants designed primarily for law enforcement agencies. The State of Texas, Criminal Justice Division funds a variety of grants for law enforcement programs for investigation, enforcement, prosecution, courts, substance abuse treatment, training, and technology. This grant is also known as/titled "421" grants. The fourth category of grants in CJD is the Statewide Texas Amber Alert Network, which was created through Executive Order RP16 and signed by Governor Rick Perry on August 12, 2002. This grant guarantees that available resources will be used to return abducted children safely to their loved ones.

The CJD also is responsible for the administration of the Texas Crime Stoppers program. This program provides funds for the administration and operation of local Texas Crime Stoppers programs and the Campus Crime Stoppers programs. Texas Crime Stoppers accepts anonymous tips and provides cash rewards when these tips lead to the indictments and/or convictions of people who commit crimes. Texas Crime Stoppers has funds available for 24-hour toll-free hotline with the purpose of gathering information on unsolved crime (State of Texas, 2005). The Crime Stoppers Programs exemplifies the true philosophies of Community Oriented Policing. Lastly, CJD offers grants to support Victims' Services projects, which 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 will be identified immediately. CJD funds provide direct services to victims of domestic violence, family violence, drunk driving, and sexual assault (State of Texas, 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 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 complete 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.

## **METHODOLOGY**

It is apparent that the State of Texas, Office of The Governor, Criminal Justice Division is a major funding source of grants for law enforcement agencies in Texas. According to the Criminal Justice Division, more than \$113 million in grants is invested in Texas criminal justice each year.

The research will be constructed in both a quantitative and qualitative manner. Quantitative methods included, but are not limited to, the frequency in which key philosophies are written in grants, along with the number of grants keywords are found. Additional quantitative analysis will include examining the money awarded to agencies based on multiple factors. The qualitative aspects will include, but are not limited to, the completeness of the grant application, amount requested, and the analysis of keywords/actions.

The research will focus on 39 funded grants that will be selected from a list of awarded State of Texas grants from the Criminal Justice Division. The grants will be selected from a posted list of awards grants from the Governor's Office, and were selected in a manner that would provide a true cross-section representation of grants based on the requesting agencies demographics. The grants selected will be from varying size agencies/entities from across the state to insure that there was no over-representation of a certain size, community, or dominance in one area of the state. The study will focus on only successfully awarded grants and covers equipment and personnel grants. All grants in the study were awarded in 2003 or later. The study includes successful grant applications from large cities and counties such as Dallas, Austin, El Paso, and Houston as well as grants from smaller communities such as Kenedy, Mount Vernon, Devine, and Karnes City. A selection of grants from varying regions and cities across Texas and from jurisdictions that vary in size will be chosen to insure an accurate cross-representation of all grants, not just grants from large cities or from only one part of the state.

The grants will be obtained through the Freedom of Information Act utilizing an open-records request. The Criminal Justice Division does not publish a list of non-awarded agencies. The research will focus 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 lobbyists. These commonalities, when placed together, should form clearly defined patterns. The study will also determine if differences exist between

personnel grants and equipment grants and whether the jurisdiction receiving the grant is a small community (less than 25,000 residents), a medium-sized jurisdiction (between 25,000 and 150,000 residents), or a large jurisdictions (more than 150,000 residents). The data retrieved from the review of the grants will be displayed in tables and models. The objective of the study was to determine what patterns will develop among grants that are awarded.

To evaluate these 39 grants, an instrument will be created to extract key information from each grant. The model appears to be unique as no other similar models or instruments were found in existing literature. The creation of the instrument will be necessary to insure equal measuring among the grants and to fully document the findings. The creation of the instrument will also serve as a model to other grant writers and educators and can easily be adapted to extract information from most grants. This information will be compiled and analyzed using Microsoft Excel. Appendix 1 is a blank copy of the instrument to be used to collect the data from each grant. The instrument was validated and altered as needed prior to its implementation. Validation of the instrument will be accomplished by examining completed grants and determining what information will need to be extracted to complete the study. The instrument was modified as needed.

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 will allow for analysis and the subdividing of 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 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 (American Heritage Dictionary, 2006), is “the critical analysis of fundamental assumptions or beliefs; A system of values by which one lives.” Each grant will be 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 will have to indicate that the philosophies were embraced by the agency and were a normal part of its operating procedure. This data will examine the use of philosophies to obtain grants and is analyzed by whether the applicant agency was considered small, medium, or large. This will indicate 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 commonplace terms in law enforcement. This data will be 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.

## **FINDINGS**

The study focused on 39 State of Texas funded grants. The grants were analyzed as a group and subsequently divided into categories for further analysis. The grants were divided into sub-categories depending on whether the grant was a personnel grant or equipment only grant. The grants were divided within the sub-groups by population of jurisdiction served (cities less than 25,000 residents, cities between 25,000 and 150,000, and cities of 150,000 or more residents). The division of grants allows for an accurate and thorough analysis of data.

The 39 grants were divided into personnel grants and equipment grants. The grants were also divided into small (15), medium (13), and large cities (11) grants.

Table I – Grants By Type And Size of Jurisdiction

<b>Grant Type</b>	<b>Small</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Large</b>
Personnel	7	10	10
Equipment	8	3	1



The first finding examined the average dollar awarded by the State of Texas government in relationship to the authorized sworn force of the applicant agency. The average of all grants per resident served was \$4.47 with a median of \$0.91. Of the 39 grants, 21 had awards of less than \$1.00 per resident served, 11 had awards of between \$1.01 and \$5.00, three had awards between \$5.01 and \$10.00, and 4 grants were awarded with funding of more than \$10.00 per resident served. The span of awards was from \$0.03 to more than \$33.00 per resident served; however, 35 grants (89.7%) 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 \$4,581.50 per square mile. However, unlike the average dollar amount per resident served, the award amount per square mile varied greatly. The highest award per square mile was more than \$28,000 per square mile while the lowest was \$7.91. 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. The data are further extrapolated into personnel grants and equipment grants.

Each of the 39 grants was analyzed for common words and they were recorded. The use of keywords and the number of grants in which they are used is shown in Table II.

Table II – Keywords/Action Frequency Utilized in Successful Grant Applications

<b>Keyword/Action</b>	<b>Number of Grants</b>	<b>Keyword/Action</b>	<b>Number of Grants</b>
Community Oriented Policing	10	Population Growth	8
Regional/Collaboration	17	Sharing Crime Data	0
Quality of Service	29	Interoperability	2
Enhance Security/Lower Crime	16	Terrorism	0
Decreased Police Budget	3	Task Force	2
Gangs/At Risk Youth	8	Efficiency	16
Homeland Security	1	Technology	10
Financially Desperate	2	Narcotics Use	7
Crime Rate/UCR	17	Operational Plans	20

The most commonly used term was Quality of Service. It was found in 74% of all grants. This indicates that regardless of the purpose of the grant, personnel or equipment, the term Quality of Service was widely used. It is also important to note that Regional/Collaboration or Enhanced Security/Lower Crime Operational Plans are mentioned in more than 16 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 “sharing data, terrorism, and task force,” appeared to have little correlation among awarded grants. On average, there are 4.31 keywords used per grant with 4.26 keywords used for personnel grants and 4.42 for equipment grants.

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 III indicates the use of these six philosophies in the 39 grants that were studied.

Table III – Use of Philosophies in Successful Grant Applications

<b>Philosophy</b>	<b>All Grants</b>	<b>Personnel Grants</b>	<b>Equipment Grants</b>
Community Oriented Policing	17	13	4
Homeland Security	1	1	0
Terrorism	1	0	1
Regional/Collaboration	18	13	5
Gangs/At Risk Youth	8	6	2
Interoperability	2	0	2

Community Oriented Policing philosophies were noted in 17 of the 39 grants (43.6%), and Regional/Collaboration was mentioned in 18 of the 39 grants (46.2%). Unlike the keyword section, the philosophies mentioned may be an action relating to the philosophy rather than the actual keywords listed. Community Oriented Policing and Regional/Collaboration philosophies are found in both personnel grants and in equipment grants regardless, of the size of the applicant agency or the size of the jurisdiction it serves. Homeland Security philosophies are only mentioned in one of the 39 grants. The last section of the study examined the frequency of three major keywords and actions as they were used in the 39 grants examined.

The frequency of keywords used in all grants is shown in Table IV. 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.

Table IV – Frequency of Terms – All Successfully Funded Grants

<b>Frequency of Terms - All Grants</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1-5</b>	<b>6-10</b>	<b>11-15</b>	<b>16-20</b>	<b>21-25</b>	<b>26+</b>	<b>Total</b>
Homeland Security	38	1	0	0	0	0	0	39
Terrorism	38	1	0	0	0	0	0	39
Community Oriented Policing	17	18	3	1	0	0	0	39

It is apparent that the most frequently used term or action is Community Oriented Policing. In 22 of the 39 grants, Community Oriented Policing or actions relating to it were mentioned. Community Oriented Policing was not mentioned in 17 grants (43.6%). It should be noted that the frequency of Homeland Security and Terrorism, or related actions, was only mentioned in 2.7% of the total grants.

In total, there were 15 grants analyzed from smaller jurisdictions (less than 25,000 residents), 13 from medium sized jurisdictions (25,000 – 125,000 residents), and 11 large jurisdictions (more than 125,000 residents). Table V illustrates the differences between the sizes of jurisdictions using all grants (personnel and equipment). Table VI illustrates differences between jurisdiction sizes in when only comparing personnel grants. Lastly, Table VII illustrates the differences between the size of jurisdictions of only equipment grants. The comparisons in Tables V, VI, and VII examine the average grant amount 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 number of philosophies used.

Table V – Average of All Successfully Funded Grants

<b>All Grants</b>	<b>Small</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Large</b>
Average Dollar Awarded per Resident Served	\$10.76	\$0.82	\$0.19
Average of Total Keywords Used	4.87	4.62	3.18
Average of Total Philosophies Used	1.27	1.31	0.82

Table VI – Average of Successfully Funded Personnel Grants

<b>Personnel Grants</b>	<b>Small</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Large</b>
Average Dollar Awarded per Resident Served	\$15.67	\$0.87	\$0.19
Average of Total Keywords Used	5.57	4.55	3.00
Average of Total Philosophies Used	1.86	1.18	0.78

Table VII – Average of Successfully Funded Equipment Grants

<b>Equipment Grants</b>	<b>Small</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Large</b>
Average Dollar Awarded per Resident Served	\$6.46	\$0.41	\$0.18
Average of Total Keywords Used	4.25	4.67	3.33
Average of Total Philosophies Used	0.75	1.67	0.67

The average amount granted by the State of Texas per resident served is the highest among small size jurisdictions at \$10.67 (Table V). When these data are broken down by grant type, personnel grants averaged \$4.49 per resident served; smaller jurisdictions had the highest dollar amount at \$15.67 (Table VI). Small jurisdictions that were awarded personnel grants had the highest number of keywords and philosophies used (Table VI). Equipment grants indicated that small sized jurisdictions had the highest dollar amount per resident served at \$6.46, and large jurisdictions had the lowest dollar amount per resident (Table VII).

Tables VIII, IX, and X indicate the frequency of key philosophy use by jurisdiction size.

Table VIII – Frequency of Terms – Successfully Funded Small Jurisdictions

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

Table IX – Frequency of Terms - Successfully Funded Medium Jurisdictions

<b>Frequency of Terms – Medium Jurisdictions</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1-5</b>	<b>6-10</b>	<b>11-15</b>	<b>16-20</b>	<b>21-25</b>	<b>26+</b>	<b>Total</b>
Homeland Security	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Terrorism	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Community Oriented Policing	6	6	1	0	0	0	0	13

Table X – Frequency of Terms - Successfully Funded Large Jurisdictions

<b>Frequency of Terms – Large Jurisdictions</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1-5</b>	<b>6-10</b>	<b>11-15</b>	<b>16-20</b>	<b>21-25</b>	<b>26+</b>	<b>Total</b>
Homeland Security	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Terrorism	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Community Oriented Policing	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	11

Additional factors were considered when analyzing these data. Each grant reviewed allowed or required the applying agencies to match state grant funds. In total, 15 of the 39 grants (38.5%) offered a larger match than required by the grant. Another finding examined if the applicant was a statewide agency, a multi-jurisdictional agency or regional agencies/partnerships. Of the 39 grants examined, 14 grants indicated that at least some aspect of their grant would be regional, statewide, or use collaborative partnerships. The last area researched was whether the applicant agencies used relevant and current statistics such as crime rate, calls for service, arrest rates, Uniform Crime Report (UCR) data, or other factual statistics. Of the 39 grants that were completed, 34 (87.2%) used current and relevant statistics.

## **DISCUSSION/CONCLUSIONS**

There is no secret word, phrase, dollar amount, or system to authoring the perfect grant. It was apparent that there were some commonalities among awarded state grants. The study of these 39 grants has provided a broad guide or model that is designed to help law enforcement write more effective grants. The study also explored the costs associated with state grants in relationship to the number of residents served by the jurisdiction 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 state 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.

It should be noted that 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 awarded agency.

A large number of grants used Community Oriented Policing and Quality of Service terms and philosophies regardless of the purpose of the grant. The use of keywords suggests that terms such as Community Oriented Policing, Quality of Service and Regional/Collaboration are common parts of awarded grants. There is an average of more than four keywords noted in the grants and as high as nine keywords were found in one grant. The use of keywords was seen in all awarded grants, with 16 using between five and nine 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 35 of the 39 (89.7%) state 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 Office of the Governor, Criminal Justice Division 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. 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. Personnel grants, such as the state's "421" and Safe and Drug Free Schools grants, pro-rate the amount they fund an agency over three years. Other personnel grants, such as the Victims of Crime Act and Violence Against Women Act grants fund a flat percentage award. Any additional funding must be supplemented by the applicant. Equipment grants with the state generally do not have a required dollar match. While 15 grantees 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. It appears the use of current data is important as it was found in 34 of 39 funded grants (87.2%), which is a significant number.

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. Without establishing partnerships, these grants may not have received funding. In total, there were 17 grants that used regional/collaboration as keywords, and 18 that used regional/collaboration as a philosophy. Of the 17 keywords, 14 were in personnel grants, and 3 were in equipment grants. Of the 18 grants in which regional/collaboration was a philosophy, 14 were personnel grants, and 4 were equipment grants. It should be noted that the trend in grants is to require collaboration with other entities in order to receive funding. The partnership between law enforcement agencies in particular regions strengthens the likelihood that grants will succeed, especially with the reallocation of state dollars and federal pass-through dollars in a post 9/11 era. Additionally, regionalizing grants were generally more cost effective and had lower administrative costs associated with 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 an inexperienced grant writers' chance for success and make the preparation of the grant easier for the writer. The lack of commonalities to previously funded grants does not use proven techniques and words 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 the funds they have access to in the future, the key components of successful grants (keywords and philosophies), a writer increases his/her chance for success. The correlation between certain aspects in grants and the grants awarded cannot be overlooked. Incorporating and demonstrating

that the agency participates in law enforcement philosophies such as Community Oriented Policing, Quality of Service, and Regional/Collaboration is paramount.

The readers and evaluators of a grant application also place emphasis on the fact that the applicant agency should be using up-to-date terms and practices, which 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. 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 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 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 areas like 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 and is not exclusive to the criminal justice/law enforcement grants. For instance, social services and healthcare providers should have funding and structure that is similar to the competitiveness of 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 use 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 state grants from a cross-section of law enforcement agencies in Texas. 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 funding means that law enforcement agencies cannot fail in their quest for 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.

## REFERENCES

- About the Training. (2002). In *Florida regional Community Policing institute*. Retrieved October 27, 2006, from Florida RCPI:  
<http://cop.spcollege.edu/cop/training/train.htm>
- 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](http://www.dhs.gov/dhspublic/interapp/editorial/editorial_0355.xml)
- Eisinger, P. (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 October 27, 2006, from Homeland Security, Budget-in-Brief Fiscal Year 2006:  
[http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/Budget\\_BIB-FY2006.pdf](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).
- Maguire, E. (1997). Structural change in large municipal police organization during the Community Policing era. *Justice Quarterly*, 14, 701-730.

- Marcuse, P. (September 2002). Urban form and globalization after September 11th: The view from New York. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 26, 596-606.
- 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 <http://www.nlc.org>:
- Roth, J., and 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. 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. (n.d.). *Biographies*. Retrieved June 18, 2008, from Answers.com Web site: <http://www.answers.com/topic/sir-robert-peel>
- State of Texas, Criminal Justice Division. (2005). Criminal Justice Division. Retrieved July 19, 2005, from <http://www.governor.state.tx.us/divisions/cjd>:

- 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](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. Retrieved from <http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/Default.asp?Item=65>:
- United States Department of Justice (COPS Office). (2006). What is Community Policing. 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/>:
- Zhao, J., Lovrich, N., & Thurman, Q. (1999). The status of Community Policing in American cities: Facilitators and impediments revisited. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 22, 74-92.



## APPENDIX/APPENDICES

### Texas Grant Instrument

Grant Source \_\_\_\_\_ Personnel \_\_\_\_\_ Equipment Only \_\_\_\_\_  
 State Dollar Amount Requested \_\_\_\_\_ %  
 Match Dollar Amount Required \_\_\_\_\_ %  
 Total Grant Project \_\_\_\_\_ %  
 More than minimum match required? Y / N      Waiver of matching funds Y / N  
 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 +