

Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority
Partnerships and Strategies to Reduce Violent Crime
FY 16-Request for Proposals

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
I. General Information	2
A. Purpose of RFP	
B. Eligible Applicants	
C. Certification of Commitment to Improve Crime Data Systems	
D. Available Funds	
E. Grant Period	
F. Application Deadline	
G. How to Apply	
H. Questions	
I. Bidder's Conference Call	
J. Notification of Award	
II. Applicant Prequalification Certification	6
III. Background, Program Overview and Design	6
IV. Focused Deterrence	11
V. Proposal Content	12
A. Cover Page	
B. Exhibit A: Program Narrative	
C. Exhibit B: Budget and Budget Narrative	
D. Attachments	
VI. Proposal Review Criteria and Procedures	14
VII. Exhibit A: Program Narrative	16

I. General Information

- A. Purpose of Request For Proposal (RFP): The Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (Authority) is soliciting proposals from eligible applicants to reduce violent crime and strengthen the relationship and trust between law enforcement and communities by completing the Problem-Oriented Policing SARA (Scanning, Analysis, Response and Assessment) assessment process, building local research and evaluation capacity, and implementing procedural justice and focused deterrence. Initial grants will be awarded for the assessment process. Subsequent grants will be awarded for training and implementation.
- B. Eligible Applicants: Municipalities within the following counties are eligible to apply for funds through this RFP:

Champaign	Sangamon
Kane	St. Clair
Kankakee	Vermillion
Lake	Will
Macon	Winnebago
Peoria	

These counties were selected through an analysis of violent crime in Illinois that identified counties with a mid-sized urban center and high crime rates.

Each eligible county should develop a partnership that consists of the city mayor; major police department(s); state's attorney's office, county sheriff's office; county probation and parole; community and faith based organizations¹ and U.S. Attorney's Offices. This group must select one governmental entity as the applicant agency that will submit the application and be responsible for submitting grant reports and other required documentation. A Memorandum of Understanding that outlines each party's roles and responsibilities is recommended as part of the application and will be

¹ Community based organization is a local not for profit agency with at least 2 years of experience working on community issues.

required before grant execution.² Applicant, including any proposed subcontractors, must report any debt due to State of Illinois or involvement in grants recovery within past five (5) years.

- C. Certification of Commitment to Improve Crime Data Systems: Eligible applicants can receive up to 5 additional points by certifying commitment to improving crime data systems. A certification form (included in the Forms section) details what the applicant agency and any relevant state agency partners would be committing to addressing over the grant cycle. Below see an explanation of the data systems:

The Criminal History Record Information system (CHRI) is the state's criminal record information system. Mandated reporting requirements are outlined in the Criminal Identification Act (20 ILCS 2630). This includes ensuring that arrest, charging, and disposition information are being properly reported.

The eTrace (Electronic Tracing System) is an Internet-based system that allows participating law enforcement agencies to submit firearm traces to the ATF National Tracing Center (NTC). Authorized users can receive firearm trace results via this same internet web site, search a database of all firearm traces submitted by their individual agency, and perform analytical functions.³

The **National Incident Based Reporting System (NIBRS)** is an incident-based reporting system for crimes known to the police. For each crime incident coming to the attention of law enforcement, a variety of data are collected about the incident.⁴ To qualify for the incentive points, the applicant must submit a NIBRS conformant five year development plan. Please contact Mike Carter via email at mike.carter@illinois.gov for more information on developing this plan.

² A MOU Template will be made available for selected applicants to use if requested.

³ See https://www.atfonline.gov/etrace/request_mou.do?action=init to request an MOU for your agency. See <http://www.icja.state.il.us/assets/sites/reduceviolentcrime/IL%20Criminal%20Justice%20Conference%20110415.pdf> for a power point overview of eTrace.

⁴ See <https://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/ucr-program-data-collections> for more information on NIBRS

D. Available Funds: The Authority has allocated \$800,000 for the first cycle which includes planning grant period of up to 12 months. Continued funding for an additional 6- to 12-month period for training and/or implementation is contingent on satisfactory progress in the preceding performance period and continued funding appropriation.

MATCHING FUNDS: Federal funds from the Byrne/JAG Program may be used to pay up to 75 percent of the program costs described in Exhibit B. Applicants must provide non-federal funding for at least 25 percent of the program costs described in Exhibit B. This means that for every \$3 in JAG funds awarded, \$1 in match is required See the award fund calculator below for guidance:

A	B	A+B=C	Confirms match value
A= Grant amount requested	Divide grant amount requested by 3	C = the requested grant award plus the required match	Divide C by 4 to confirm match amount
\$200,000	\$66,667	\$266,667	\$66,667
\$175,000	\$58,333	\$233,333	\$58,333
\$150,000	\$50,000	\$200,000	\$50,000
\$125,000	\$41,667	\$166,667	\$41,667
\$100,000	\$33,333	\$133,333	\$33,333
\$75,000	\$25,000	\$100,000	\$25,000
\$50,000	\$16,667	\$66,667	\$16,667

Please note that the Authority follows the federal guidelines for matching funds which requires that matching funds not be used to supplant existing funds.

WAIVER: Applicants can request a match waiver based on financial hardship. If you would like to request a match waiver, you should submit a letter, on your agency's letterhead with your application. Your letter requesting a match waiver should include the following minimum requirements.

- A brief description of your agency and your proposed JAG funded project
- A thorough explanation of why the full/partial match amount is a financial hardship for your agency
- Indicate how much match you are able to provide, if any, and what amount you are requesting to be waived
- Any other important information you want to add

SUPPLANTING: Supplanting means to deliberately reduce or reallocate state or local funds because of the existence of federal funds. Therefore, applicants must maintain a level of non-federal financial support (such as state or local support) for criminal justice system or crime victim assistance activities, exclusive of any federal funds, that is equal to, or greater than, the non-federal level existing prior to receiving federal funds. An example of supplanting would be: State funds are appropriated for a particular criminal justice purpose and federal funds are awarded for that same criminal justice purpose; the applicant replaces its appropriated state funds with federal funds, thereby reducing the total amount available for that criminal justice purpose.

Supplanting Guidelines.

(1) Guidelines for New Programs. Applicants must adhere to the following guidelines when implementing new programs:

- Federal Funds. For **all federal grant programs**:
 - Federal grant funds must not be used to pay existing employees' salaries, and, if used for personnel, must be used to pay for salaries of **new hires**, with the following exceptions:
 - (1) Federal grant funds may be used to pay salaries of existing employees who are now performing in a grant program position, if their previous non-grant position is "**back-filled**" through the hire of a new employee.
 - (2) Federal grant funds may be used to pay salaries of existing employees if their work on the program is in addition to their existing, established work

schedule (**overtime**).

- In addition, federal funds must not be used to pay existing contractual obligations (i.e., existing leases), but must be used to pay **additional costs** incurred because of the grant program. For example, federal funds may be used for rental costs only when the grantee has to acquire additional rental space for grant funded personnel, and the grantee does not own or have a financial interest in the rental space.
- Cash Match. For programs that require **cash match**:
 - Cash matching funds used for personnel must be used to pay for salaries of **new hires**, with the following exceptions:
 - (1) Cash matching funds may be used to pay salaries of existing employees who are now performing in a grant program position, if their previous non-grant position is “**back-filled**” through the hire of a new employee.
 - (2) Cash matching funds may be used to pay salaries of existing employees if their work on the program is in addition to their existing, established work schedule (**overtime**).
 - In addition, cash matching funds may only be used to pay for **additional costs** incurred because of the grant program. For example, cash matching funds may be used to pay for additional utilities costs incurred because of the grant program.

~~Supplanting: Awarded funds must be used to supplement existing funds for grant activities and must not replace those funds that have been appropriated for the same purpose.~~ Supplanting shall be the subject of application review, as well as pre-award review, post-award monitoring, and audit. If there is a potential presence of supplanting, the applicant or grantee will be required to supply documentation

demonstrating that the reduction in non-Authority funds resources occurred for reasons other than the receipt or expected receipt of Authority funds.

This agreement is contingent upon and subject to the availability of funds. The Authority, at its sole option, may terminate or suspend this agreement, in whole or in part, without penalty or further payment being required, if (1) the Illinois General Assembly or the federal funding source fails to make an appropriation sufficient to pay such obligation, or if funds needed are insufficient for any reason (30 ILCS 500/20-60), (2) the Governor decreases the Authority's funding by reserving some or all of the Authority appropriation(s) pursuant to power delegated to the Governor by the Illinois General Assembly; or (3) the Authority determines, in its sole discretion or as directed by the Office of the Governor, that a reduction is necessary or advisable based upon actual or projected budgetary considerations. Implementing Entity will be notified in writing of the failure of appropriation or of a reduction or decrease.

E. Grant Period: The grant performance start date is anticipated to be August 19, 2016. The performance period will be dependent on grantee planning needs. Continued funding is contingent upon satisfactory progress in the preceding performance period and continued funding appropriation. The Authority reserves the right to consider a no-cost extension if the circumstances warrant and it is approved by the Authority.

F. Application Deadline: Proposals must be received by 12 p.m. on Wednesday, May 18, June 8, 2016. To be accepted for consideration, proposals must meet the requirements set forth in the RFP.

Within 48 hours after submitting your electronic application, you should receive e-mail notification that the application was received and validated or that it was rejected and an explanation of the rejection.

You are urged to submit your application at least 72 hours prior to application deadline to allow time to correct issues that may have caused a rejection notice.

If you experience unforeseen technical issues beyond your control, you must contact Authority staff within 24 hours after the due date and request approval to submit your application. At that time, Authority staff will require you to e-mail the complete grant application and full explanation of the technical issues which caused your inability to meet the application deadline. The Authority will contact you to either approve or deny the request.

To ensure a fair competition for limited grant funds, when late submissions are considered, the following conditions will not be accepted: 1) failure to begin the registration process in sufficient time; 2) failure to follow Authority instructions on how to register and apply as posted in the RFP; and, 3) technical issues experienced with the applicant's computer or information technology (IT) environment.

H. How to Apply: Applications can be obtained at <http://www.icjia.state.il.us/Partnerships2016>. Applications must be submitted by following the online application process. Proposals will not be accepted by mail or in-person. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Authority of any submittal difficulties, as described in the section of this application titled, "Application: Deadline."

I. Questions: If you have a question, please email CJA.Partnerships@Illinois.gov and you will receive a response within five business days. The deadline for submitting questions is 5 p.m. ~~on Monday, May 9~~ **Tuesday, May 31**, 2016 to ensure all substantive questions and answers are accessible to all applicants. Do not discuss your offer to this solicitation, directly or indirectly, with any Authority employee other than the respondent of this email address. Only written answers to questions shall be binding on the State. All substantive questions and responses will be posted on the Authority's website, www.icjia.state.il.us.

J. Bidder's Conference Call: The Authority will hold a Bidder's Conference Call on Wednesday, April 13, 2016 at 10 a.m. The conference call number is: 888-494-4032. Access Code: 7640884751. All substantive questions and answers will be posted on the Authority's website, www.icjia.state.il.us

K. Notification of Award: Applicants recommended for funding will be notified via letter within 360 days of application receipt.

II. Applicant Prequalification Certification

Authority requirements state that all agencies receiving funds shall obtain a DUNS (Data Universal Numbering System) number. Applicants that do not already have a DUNS number can obtain one from Dun and Bradstreet, Inc. online at www.dunandbradstreet.com or by calling 1-866-705-5711. In addition to a DUNS number, grantees shall maintain a current registration in the System for Award Management (SAM) database. Each agency listed in the application who will receive funds as part of this grant (including the applicant) must provide a DUNS number, SAM registration expiration date, and CAGE Code as part of the applicant's proposal submission. Information about SAM registration procedures can be accessed at www.sam.gov.

III. Background, Program Overview, and Design

The Authority is the state's primary criminal justice research and grant making agency. Its mission is to improve criminal justice outcomes and help create a more effective criminal justice system through research, funding, technical assistance, and by coordinating the development of information systems.

The statutory responsibilities of the Authority fit into four areas: grants administration; research and analysis; policy and planning; and information systems and technology. Related to grant administration, the Authority is the state administering agency for the Bureau of Justice Assistance's (BJA) Byrne Justice Assistance Grant Program (JAG) for which there are seven purpose areas: 1) Law Enforcement; 2) Courts, Prosecution and Indigent Defense; 3) Prevention and Education Programs; 4) Corrections and Community Corrections Programs; 5) Drug Treatment and Enforcement Programs; 6) Crime Victim and Witness Programs; and 7) Planning, Evaluation and Technology Improvement Programs. Under the Law Enforcement Purpose Area, the Authority is committed to funding programs that support the development and implementation of policing strategies that are data-driven, evidence-informed or have promise to reduce serious crime, especially violent crime, and strengthen partnerships and trust between citizens and the justice system. The goal of this solicitation is to select local jurisdictions in

which to seed procedural justice and focused deterrence which require significant community engagement and cross-systems collaboration.

The initial grant period will be the first of up to three funding periods for this initiative; however, renewal is contingent on satisfactory progress in the preceding performance period and continued funding appropriation.

Jurisdictions will have varying degrees of readiness to implement procedural justice and focused deterrence which require a significant community engagement and cross-systems collaboration.

To facilitate readiness and promote implementation the Authority will make available funds (through separate contracts) for the each step of the process: assessment, training and implementation. Although the steps are sequential, an applicant can request exemption from the assessment period if they can demonstrate recent completion of planning and assessment.

Applicants interested in requesting an exemption should complete the RFP as outlined, justify the use of an alternative assessment model, why it meets the needs of the planning phase and include a recent assessment report. If justification is sufficient and application is recommended for funding, the Authority may ask for additional information to determine funding for the 2nd or 3rd cycle of program.

Program Overview

This purpose of this multi-year program is to reduce group related violent crime through improving the trust and working relationships between communities and law enforcement as well as strengthening governmental collaboration.

Consistent with national trends, Illinois has experienced an overall decline in its violent index crime rate since the early 1990s. In fact, Illinois has experienced a decline in its violent index crime rate nearly every year since 1993, the year when violent crime peaked in Illinois. Today, Illinois violent index crime rate is 66% lower than in it was in 1993. Similar declines were noted for both murder and reported aggravated assaults and batteries. Although these trends are encouraging, high rates of violent crime and victimization continue to plague many communities in Illinois, with some communities experiencing violent index crime, murder, and aggravated assault and battery rates notably above the state's average. Illinois' communities that experience higher levels of crime and victimization also tend to suffer from high and persistent

concentrations of social and economic disadvantage, including unemployment, poverty, family disruption, and racial isolation. These communities also experience disproportionate rates of incarceration.

The overreliance on incarceration at the community level stands in stark contrast to what research has established about high rates of crime; namely, that an extremely small number of people, who often operate in groups or gangs, are responsible for most serious offenses. In fact, researchers in Boston found that gangs consisting of less than 1 percent of the city's youth (between age 14 and 24) perpetrated more than 60 percent of the city's youth homicide (Braga & Weisburd, 2015.) Given this it is most effective for law enforcement strategies to be directed at these groups and gangs rather than the whole community.

Research has shown that trust is an essential aspect of the criminal justice system. (Meares, 2009). The importance of law enforcement's role is highlighted by the recent President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing. The task force's final report opens by stating, "trust between law enforcement agencies and the people they protect and serve is essential in a democracy. It is the key to the stability of our communities, the integrity of our criminal justice system, and the safe and effective delivery of policing services" (Presidents Task Force on 21st Century Policing, 2015, p. 1). In fact, the quintessential Boston Ceasefire, focused deterrence implementation would not have been so successful if it weren't for the long standing and robust collaborative relationship the Boston Police Department had with a community violence prevention group called the Ten Point Coalition (Braga & Winship, 2006).

The primary law enforcement mechanism to rebuild trust is through implementing procedural justice principles and practices throughout the law enforcement agency. Applicants selected through this solicitation will be required to be trained in these concepts and to incorporate them into their implementation plan. In summary, procedural justice is based on four key pillars:

1. Fairness (the perception that you will be treated equitably).
2. Voice (the perception that your side of the story has been heard).
3. Transparency (the perception that processes are explained to you).

4. Impartiality (the perception that the decision-making process is unbiased and trustworthy) (Tyler, 1990).

Program Design

Jurisdictions will have varying degrees of readiness to implement procedural justice and focused deterrence. To facilitate readiness and promote implementation the Authority will make available funds (through separate contracts) for each of the three steps of the process: assessment, training and implementation. Although the steps are sequential, an applicant can request exemption from the assessment period if they can demonstrate recent completion of planning and assessment. Applicants interested in this should complete this entire RFP as outlined, justify the use of an alternative assessment model, why it meets the needs of the planning phase and also include their recent assessment report. If justification is sufficient and application is recommended for funding, the Authority may ask for additional information in order to fund applicant for the 2nd or 3rd cycle of program.

First Cycle: Planning

Selected jurisdictions will convene local multi-disciplinary teams (MDTs) consisting of the city mayor, law enforcement, local and federal prosecutors, community corrections (probation, parole), and community stakeholders. Each agency's commitment to the assessment process is essential to its success. Each agency is responsible for assigning a staff member with decision making power to attend the regular (at minimum monthly) meetings, share information and data (when applicable); participate in the planning grant activities listed below:

- Enhance effective working relationships with community, criminal justice and social service agencies.
- Collaborate across criminal justice agencies.
- Conduct crime analyses using the Problem-Oriented Policing SARA (Scanning, Analysis, Response and Assessment) Model.(The Problem-Oriented Policing SARA Model is a highly regarded and utilized comprehensive tool for local law enforcement officials to identify their needs and focus their work. More details regarding the SARA Model and a

comprehensive outline can be found at <http://www.popcenter.org/about?p=sara>.⁵) See Performance Metric in Exhibit A for minimally required data elements.

- Conduct assessment of community and police relations.
- Identify training needs.

Planning period funds may be allocated to:

- A full-time project manager to facilitate leadership development and cross-system collaboration, engage in the SARA assessment process for the MDT in partnership with an identified research partner, and develop an implementation plan.
- A research partner to assist the MDT in conducting crime analysis and developing an implementation plan that includes data collection to facilitate a process and outcome evaluation.
- Travel within Illinois to attend regional networking and information sharing events.
- See the Federal Fiscal Guidelines for a complete list of allowable and unallowable costs at <http://ojp.gov/financialguide/index.htm>.

Second Cycle: Training

Jurisdictions that have demonstrated training needs, as identified during the planning phase, to assist in implementation may seek additional funding to address those needs. Continued funding for training and/or implementation is contingent on satisfactory progress in the preceding performance period and continued funding appropriation. Training funds will be made available to:

- Assist in MDT agencies accessing training on focused deterrence, procedural justice and community engagement.
- Ongoing technical assistance provided by identified experts.

Third Cycle: Implementation

⁵ Applicants wishing to propose using a different assessment model must justify why the alternative model meets the applicant's needs and how it compares to the SARA model.

Once the assessment process (SARA Model preferred) and training is completed, jurisdictions may apply for implementation funding. Continued funding for training and/or implementation is contingent on satisfactory progress in the preceding performance period and continued funding appropriation. Grant deliverables and measures will be dependent on the selected model.

IV. Focused Deterrence Strategies

Focused deterrence, also known as “pulling levers,” is listed as a promising practice on crime solutions.gov and is supported by the US Department of Justice. Below, we have provided a brief summary of the model and encourage potential applicants to also see the *Group Violence Intervention Implementation Guide* funded by the Community Oriented Policing Strategies Office for more information.

Focused deterrence was pioneered in Boston in the 1990s, where it was coined “Boston Ceasefire.” The strategy is being implemented nationally in many large and small communities. The framework includes:

- Drawing on effective relationships between criminal justice agencies, community groups and social service agencies with a strong collaboration history.
- Selecting a particular crime problem, such as youth homicide or open air drug markets.
- Pulling together an interagency enforcement group, typically including police, probation, parole, state and federal prosecutors, and sometimes federal law enforcement agencies.
- Conducting research, usually relying heavily on the field experience of front-line police officers, to identify key offenders, and groups of offenders such as street gangs, drug crews, and the like-and the patterns and context of their behavior.
- Framing a special enforcement operation directed at those offenders and groups of offenders, such as using any and all legal tools (or levers) to sanction groups
- Matching those enforcement operations with direct services and the moral voices of affected communities to those same offenders and groups.
- Communicating directly and repeatedly with offenders and groups that they are under particular scrutiny, what acts (such as shootings) will get special attention, when that has, in fact, happened to particular offenders and groups, and what they can do to avoid enforcement action. One form of this communications is the “forum” “notification” or

“call in,” in which offenders are invited or directed (usually because they are on probation or parole) to attend face-to-face meetings with law enforcement officials, service providers, and community figures. (Kennedy, 2006)

Many jurisdictions implementing focused deterrence have shown marked reductions in violence ranging from 63-percent reduction in youth homicides in Boston to a 34 percent reduction in total homicides in Indianapolis (Braga, Kennedy, Waring, & Piehl, 2001; McGarrell, Chermak, Wilson, & Cosaro, 2006). In 2012, the Campbell Collaboration Crime and Justice Group conducted a systematic review and concluded very positively stating that the approach can positively alter offenders’ perceptions of sanction risk. The review also noted that the collaboration and coordination across multiple criminal justice agencies is a key aspect of the successful implementation of the model. In fact, the Campbell Review noted that the multi-faceted strategies used in this model are largely responsible for the dramatic reductions in violence (Braga, Papachristos, & Hureau, 2012).

IV: Proposal Content

To be accepted for consideration, proposals must meet the requirements set forth in this RFP. Applications must be submitted by following the online application process described in Section I. The online application process will require you to complete items A-D outlined below.

A. Items 1-44: Applicant Information

B. Exhibit A: Proposal narrative that includes the following sections:

- 1) One-page executive summary
- 2) Statement of Problem
 - a. Local crime statistics
 - b. Current local data collection and analysis capacity
 - c. Current strategies to address violent crime
- 3) Community Description
 - a. Demographics
 - b. Current state and local agencies that address violent crime
 - c. Community engagement and community police relationships

d. Strengths and Challenges

4) Multi-Disciplinary Team

a. List each criminal justice agency that will be part of the jurisdiction's multi-disciplinary team. Also include the commitment from each entity regarding meeting roles and responsibility. Some deliverables include attendance of decision makers at regular (at minimum monthly) meetings; agreements to share crime data (when applicable); participation in the planning grant activities as described in Section III: Program Design.

b. History and current degree of collaboration across criminal justice agencies

5) Project management

a. Planning grant Implementation Schedule

b. Performance Metrics

C. Exhibit B: Budget and Budget Narrative

- ☐ Each budget category is totaled correctly and the total line for each budget reflects both a federal/state amount and match (if you plan to show match).
- ☐ If no costs are anticipated in a section of the budget itemization, write "not applicable" in that section.
- ☐ The Budget Narrative provides the justification and information necessary to 1) determine the manner in which the budget detail was computed, and 2) the relationship between major budget components and the achievement of the project goals.
- ☐ Completed budget
- ☐ Review the Authority's Financial Guide for Allowable and Non Allowable costs at <http://ojp.gov/financialguide/index.htm>

D. Attachments

Documentation of compliance with each of the following requirements:

YES	N/A	Item(s) to submit
		One page Executive Summary
		Program Narrative (12-font, Calibri)
		Budget and Budget Narrative
		Certification of Commitment to Improve Crime Data Systems

V. REVIEW CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES

Proposals will be reviewed by a panel of the Authority staff with expertise in this area. The narrative must address all parts of the RFP and demonstrates an ability to successfully implement the proposal. The Authority intends to fund the most competitive applicants.

Proposal selection will be made using the criteria listed below. The Authority reserves the right to reject any or all proposals if it is determined that submission(s) are not satisfactory. The Authority also reserves the right to invite one or more applicants to resubmit amended proposals. The chart below shows the elements of responsiveness that we will evaluate. The total number of points for responsiveness is: 100.

Scoring Criteria	Possible Points
Executive Summary: provides a clear, concise summary of the proposal. States problems or needs, objectives and outcomes to be gained.	10
Statement of the Problem: clearly established need and explains the problem. Includes relevant and requested facts, statistics, or other measures of the problem/need. Clearly explains current strategies being implemented.	20
Community Description: clearly states required demographics. Provides a clear description of current agencies addressing issue. Clearly describes extent of community engagement and community-police relationships.	20
Multi-Disciplinary Team: Clearly describes how project success will be measured; includes who, how and when data will be collected.	15
Project Management: Clearly describes responsible party, timeline, how each objective will be accomplished and resources needed.	10

Goals, Objectives and Performance Indicators:	5
Adequacy of Cost Estimates	
Budget: Is complete, allowable and cost-effective in relations to the proposed activities.	10
Budget Narrative: clearly details how the applicant arrived at and calculated the budget amounts, including match if applicable.	10
Total Possible Points	100
Total Possible Points with Certification of Commitment to Improve Crime Data Systems	105

A panel of the Authority's senior staff will do a final review of proposals for allowability of costs. The Authority uses federal standards to determine allowability of all grant funds. Review the Federal Financial Guide for Allowable and Unallowable costs at <http://ojp.gov/financialguide/index.htm>. Reviewers' recommendations will be forwarded to the Authority Budget Committee for approval. A preliminary award decision will be made and applicants will be notified of the Budget Committee's decision. Successful applicants whose proposals contained unallowable costs will have their award reduced by the total amount of all unallowable costs.

Note: Proposed project costs for services, activities, and other items will be assessed to determine how realistic they are, and the extent to which they have been allocated in a cost-efficient and effective manner.

VI. Exhibit A: Proposal Narrative

1. One-page executive summary
2. Statement of problem:
 - a. Provide a comprehensive description of the jurisdiction's violent crime issues.
 - b. Provide local crime statistics

	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year
Total number of firearm-related					

aggravated assault and battery incidents and victims by year for the last five years.*					
Total number of firearm-related homicide incidents and victims by year for the last five years.					
Total number and % of firearm-related homicides and aggravated assault and battery incidents involving gangs or groups by year for the last five years.					
Calls for service for shootings by year for the last five available years.					

*Applicant can include additional years and/or additional data if available.

Please note that selected applicants will be required to report on these and possibly additional crime data elements on a quarterly basis. Grantees will be asked to summarize how the data is informing their assessment and selection process. In addition, as part of the assessment process, grantees should demonstrate a familiarity with their relevant data, the ability to acquire it and interpret it for planning purposes.

- c. Provide a description of the applicant's and partner criminal justice agency's current local data collection and analysis capacity.

- d. Provide a description of the current strategies employed to address violent crime throughout the local criminal justice system.
3. Community Description:
 - a. Provide a comprehensive description of the selected community. Be sure to include, at minimum, demographics, such as race, ethnicity, age, high school graduation rates, poverty levels, and unemployment rate.
 - b. Provide a description of current state and local criminal justice agencies and community organizations that address violent crime.
 - c. Provide a description of the extent of community engagement and community police relationships.
 - d. Provide a description of the strengths and challenges that your community faces.
4. Multidisciplinary Team:
 - a. List each criminal justice agency that will be part of the jurisdiction's multi-disciplinary team.
 - b. Include the commitment from each entity to meeting roles and responsibility. Some deliverables include attendance of decision-makers at regular (monthly at minimum) meetings, agreement to share crime data (when applicable), and participation in the planning grant activities as described in Section III: Program Design.
 - c. Provide a description of the history and degree of current collaboration across criminal justice agencies.
5. Project management
 - a. Thoroughly complete the Implementation Schedule

The purpose of this Implementation Schedule below is to help the applicant identify and facilitate an effective project. Applicants should include major tasks and events with sufficient detail.

Activity	Month Begun	Month Completed	Personnel Responsible	If ongoing, how often?

- b. Complete the performance metrics chart by filling in the information marked with XX. Additional metrics may be added during the planning period.

Performance Metrics

Goals, Objectives and Performance Indicators

Goal: To reduce group-related violent crime through strengthened governmental collaboration and increased trust between law enforcement and the communities they serve.	
Process objectives	
Hire MDT Program Manager by XX date or XX month of the program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date MDT Program Manager hired
Form Multi-disciplinary Team (MDT) composed of community stakeholders and decision makers from the city Mayor's office, law enforcement, local and federal prosecution and community corrections by second month of the program.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date MDT formed • MDT membership by agency affiliation and assigned staff.
Hire Research Partner by XX date or XX month of the program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date Research Partner hired
Convene regular MDT (at minimum monthly) MDT meetings which include at least XX % of all required members in attendance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of meetings held • Number of meetings with at least 80 % of all assigned staff of required agencies in attendance.
Identify and convene meetings with XX community agencies and leaders to discuss procedural justice, planning process and survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of meetings convened • List of community agencies contacted
Implement survey that assesses community perceptions of law enforcement to at least XX % of community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of surveys released • Number of completed surveys returned

Survey results are prepared in report by XX date, reviewed by MDT Partners and community leaders.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date survey report submitted for MDT review
MDT partners and community leaders review survey report by XX date	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date of survey report review by MDT partners and community leaders
<p>Submit required crime data to MDT for review. At minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shootings by date/time, suspect(s) and victim(s) involved, group(s) involved, neighborhood, motive, weapon(s) used • Individual and group-specific data for targeted intervention • Total crime guns recovered and submitted to ATF for trace 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • XX months/quarters required data reported to MDT for review. • Number of Shootings by date/time, suspect(s) and victim(s) involved, group(s) involved, neighborhood, motive, weapon(s) used • Number of Individual and group-specific data for targeted intervention • Total crime guns recovered and submitted to ATF for trace
Attend regional MDT information sharing events hosted by the Authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of Authority information sharing events attended • Number and agency affiliation of attendees
Initiate SARA analysis by XX date	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date SARA analysis initiated • Number of MDT meetings in which key tasks are accomplished as reflected in meeting notes.
Complete SARA analysis by XX date	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date SARA analysis completed
MDT reviews and accepts SARA analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date of MDT review/approval of SARA analysis
Develop draft plan for Year Two by XX date	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date draft plan developed

References

- Braga, A.A., Kennedy, D.M., Waring, E.J., & Piehl, A.M. (2001). Problem-oriented policing, deterrence, and youth violence: An evaluation of Boston's Operation Ceasefire. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 38(3), 195-226.
- Braga, A. A., & Winship, D. (2006). Partnership, accountability, and innovation: clarifying Boston's experience with pulling levers. In A. Braga & D. Weisburd (Eds.), *Police innovation contrasting perspectives* (pp. 171-187). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Braga, A., Papachristos, A., & Hureau, D. Hot spots policing effects on crime. *Campbell Systematic Reviews* 2012:8
- Kennedy, D. M. (2006). Old wine in new bottles: policing and the lessons of pulling levers. In A. Braga & D. Weisburd (Eds.), *Police innovation contrasting perspectives* (pp. 155-170). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- McGarrell, E.F., Chermak, S., Wilson, J.M., & Corsaro, N. (2006). Reducing, homicide through a "lever-pulling" strategy, *Justice Quarterly*, 23(2), 214-231.

Meares, T. (2009). The legitimacy of police among young African-American men. *Marquette Law Review*, 92 (4), 651-666.

National Network for Safe Communities. 2013. *Group Violence Intervention: An Implementation Guide*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing. (2015). *Final report of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing*. Washington, DC: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

Tyler, T. R. (1990). *Why people obey the law*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.