

FOIA MARKER

**This is not a textual record. This is used as an
administrative marker by the William J. Clinton
Presidential Library Staff.**

Collection/Record Group: Clinton Presidential Records

Subgroup/Office of Origin: Domestic Policy Council

Series/Staff Member: Leanne Shimabukuro

Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 23169

FolderID:

Folder Title:

Crime/Columbine Shooting Response [2]

Stack:

S

Row:

98

Section:

4

Shelf:

11

Position:

3



U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Community Oriented Policing Services

Communications Division

1100 Vermont Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20530

For Immediate Release
Thursday, April 22, 1999

Contact: Dan Pfeiffer
(202) 616-1728

**PRESIDENT CLINTON ANNOUNCES FUNDS TO PUT
OFFICERS IN AMERICA'S SCHOOLS**

336 Communities to Receive Funds to Hire 604 Officers to Work in Schools

WASHINGTON, D.C. —President Clinton and the U.S. Department of Justice's Office of Community Oriented Policing Services today announced the awarding of \$70 million to 336 communities to fund the hiring of 604 community policing officers to work in primary and secondary schools.

"The recent tragedy in Littleton reminds us of the critical need to make sure our schools are safe places for America's children to learn," President Clinton said. "The COPS in Schools program provides communities with an opportunity to develop their own solutions to the problem of school violence."

President Clinton announced the COPS in Schools program in October at the School Safety Conference at the White House. COPS in Schools grants fund the hiring of community policing officers to work in schools. Grants are for up to \$125,000 to pay for the salary and benefits of each new officer over three years. Funds are still available under this program. The application deadlines for the next round of grants are June 4 and July 16.

The COPS in Schools program is part of the Clinton/Gore Administration's initiative to fund the addition of 100,000 community policing officers to the beat. To date, the COPS program has funded more than 92,000 officers.

"The presence of a trained community policing officer in a school reduces crime and violence," said Joseph E. Brann, Director of the COPS Office. "From patrolling the halls to counseling troubled students, these officers free teachers to educate and students to learn."

Grants are being awarded to the following states: Alaska; Alabama; Arkansas; Arizona; California; Connecticut; Florida; Georgia; Florida; Iowa; Idaho; Illinois; Indiana; Kansas; Kentucky; Louisiana; Massachusetts; Maryland; Maine; Michigan; Minnesota; Missouri; Mississippi; Montana; Nebraska; North Carolina; North Dakota; New Hampshire; New Jersey; New Mexico; New York; Ohio; Oklahoma; Oregon; Pennsylvania; South Carolina; Tennessee; Texas; Utah; Virginia; Vermont; Wisconsin; West Virginia; Wyoming.

###

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Community Oriented Policing Services



COPS Fact Sheet

www.usdoj.gov/cops/

COPS in Schools

"When our children's safety is at stake, we must take action - and we all must do our part."

President Clinton

Program Information

Recent headlines about violence in our schools are resulting in a surge of interest in school safety. Unfortunately, these headline-making crimes are not isolated incidents.

According to the National Education Association:

- 100,000 children carry guns to school;
- 160,000 children miss class every day because of the fear of physical harm; and
- 81 percent of teachers say they spend most of their time on undisciplined students.

Many communities are discovering that trained, sworn Law enforcement officers assigned to schools make a difference. The presence of these officers provide schools with on-site security and a direct link to local law enforcement agencies.

Community policing officers typically perform a variety of functions within the school. From teaching crime prevention and substance-abuse classes to monitoring troubled students to building respect for law enforcement among students, School Resource Officers combine the functions of law enforcement and education.

To help hire community policing officers to work in schools, the COPS Office is offering up to \$60 million to local law enforcement agencies. The COPS in Schools initiative provides an incentive for law enforcement agencies to build working relationships with schools to use community policing efforts to combat school violence.

The COPS in Schools initiative reduces the local match requirement for law enforcement agencies seeking to hire additional officers in and around schools.

Funding Requirements

Grants will be awarded to provide for a designated portion of the salary and benefits of each new officer over three years. The maximum is \$125,000 per officer; any remainder is paid with state or local funds. Funding begins when new officers are hired or on the award date (whichever is later). Funds are distributed over the course of the grant.

COPS grants must not replace funds that eligible agencies otherwise would have devoted to hire officers in the future. In other words, any hiring under the COPS in Schools program must be in addition to, not in lieu of, officers that otherwise would have been hired. Grant recipients must develop a written plan to retain their COPS-funded officer positions after Federal funding ends. This plan must be submitted with the application.

Program Requirements

To be eligible to receive funding under this grant program, applicants must:

- be eligible to receive funding under the current guidelines established for the Universal Hiring Program (UHP);
- provide assurance that the officers employed under this program will be assigned to work in primary or secondary schools;
- enter into a partnership agreement with either a specific school official or with an official with general educational oversight authority in that jurisdiction.

In addition to these program requirements, applicants must document:

- **Problem Identification and Justification**

For Example:

Problem Identification: Gang violence adjacent to or within schools.

Justification: Documentation such as crime data, information on the number of gang members in a particular school, number of suspension and expulsions related to gang activities, school survey, and complaints from the community.

- **Community Policing Strategies**

Examples include conflict mediation, mentoring activities, gang mediation, problem solving projects, and truancy programs.

- **Quality and Level of Commitment to Program**

Examples include the amount of dedicated officer hours deployed to school activities, the duration and quality of the proposed program, evidence of previous successes, and a description of the impacted or targeted areas.

- **Link to Community Policing**

Information on how proposed activities are linked to an overall organizational community policing strategy.

Deadlines

Use the Universal Hiring Program application to apply for COPS in Schools grants. The application deadlines are December 4, 1998, February 5, April 2, June 4 and July 16, 1999. If your agency already was awarded a FAST, AHEAD or UHP grant, you may request additional officers at any time. Note on your application if you are requesting officers that will be assigned to primary or secondary schools.

For More Information

To obtain a copy of an application or for more information, please call the U.S. Department of Justice Response Center at 1-800-421-6770 or visit the COPS website at www.usdoj.gov/cops/

Departments that have a pending application under the Universal Hiring Program and that are interested in applying that request to the COPS in Schools initiative should contact their grant advisor at 1-800-421-6770.

Updated: December 9, 1998

FS-cis-002

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Community Oriented Policing Services



COPS Fact Sheet

www.usdoj.gov/cops/

School-Based Partnerships '99

As part of the Clinton Administration's commitment to combat and prevent crime in and around America's schools, the Justice Department's Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) has a new grant program, School-Based Partnerships '99, designed to keep children safe by reducing school-related crime. This program, will help make schools safer for all children.

The COPS Office was created by Attorney General Janet Reno to promote community policing and to add 100,000 community policing officers and deputies to America's streets.

Program Information

The School-Based Partnerships grant program will provide policing agencies with a unique opportunity to work with schools and community-based organizations to address persistent school-related crime problems. Applicants must focus on one primary school-related crime or disorder problem, occurring in or around an elementary or secondary school, such as:

- Drug Dealing or Use on School Grounds;
- Problems Experienced by Students on the Way to and from School;
- Assault/Sexual Assault;
- Alcohol Use or Alcohol-Related Problems/DWI;
- Threat/Intimidation;
- Vandalism/Graffiti;
- Loitering and Disorderly Conduct Directly Related to Crime or Student Safety;
- Disputes that Pose a Threat to Student Safety; and
- Larceny

The School-Based Partnerships program emphasizes problem analysis, a key component of problem solving, to help develop effective responses, including prevention and intervention efforts. For example, a problem analysis might show that 80 percent of the assaults on students at a particular school are committed by truant students with prior arrest records from other schools. A comprehensive response to this problem might involve a collaborative effort among a team of social services personnel, school administrative staff, police and probation officers. This team might work together to change policies and improve communication to exert more control over the offenders and problem behaviors. Similarly, other responses may include: training students in conflict resolution, restorative justice/community justice initiatives, crime awareness/prevention programs, programs targeting likely victims and offenders at high-risk times, social service intervention programs, physical changes in the environment to reduce the problem, and school policy and procedural changes.

Applicants will use problem-solving methods to understand the causes of the problem; develop specific, tailor-made responses to that problem; and assess the impact of those responses. To help communities use creative problem solving to address school-related problems, this grant will fund resources such as: computer technology; crime analysis personnel; the cost of conducting student surveys and victim/offender interviews; the cost of community organizers, school personnel and/or students involved in analyzing or coordinating the project; and training and technical assistance in collaborative problem solving. To complement this grant program, school resource officers may be hired through the COPS Universal Hiring Program (UHP) and/or the COPS in Schools grant program.

Although this grant program is focused on the careful analysis of a specific school-related crime problem, it is not intended to be overly complex or technical. Applicants are not expected to be experts in problem solving and crime analysis. Any organization concerned with school safety or crime issues is encouraged to participate in this program. Applicants that would like assistance in problem-solving techniques are encouraged to plan for such technical assistance in their project budgets.

Funding Provisions

Grant funds must be used to supplement, and not supplant, state or local funds that otherwise would be devoted to public safety activities.

Eligibility Requirements

All local, Indian tribal, school police departments (consisting of officers with sworn authority) and other public law enforcement agencies committed to community policing are eligible to apply. Law enforcement agencies must partner with either a specific school, school district or a nonprofit organization. A partnership between a policing agency and a specific school or school district is encouraged, but if such a partnership is not practical, a policing agency may partner with a nonprofit community group. A collaboration agreement outlining the conditions and benefits each participant will contribute to the project must be included in the application.

Law enforcement agencies (primary applicants) may submit only one application. Schools or community-based entities (secondary applicants) that apply as partners are expected to include student representatives in the project.

Receiving an award under the School-Based Partnerships '99 program will not affect the eligibility of an agency to receive awards under other COPS programs.

The deadline for applications is **April 30, 1999**. Applications, which will be available in March, must be postmarked by April 30, 1999, to be eligible.

Grant Application Guide

"Problem-Solving Tips: A Guide to Reducing Crime and Disorder Through Problem-Solving Partnerships" is available to aid applicants in completing their application. The guide provides background information on most of the questions found in the grant application.

Applications will be available in early March. To obtain an application and the companion guide, or for more information, call the U.S. Department of Justice Response Center at 1-800-421-6770. A copy of the application kit and "Problem-Solving Tips" also will be available in early March on the COPS Office web site at:

<http://www.usdoj.gov/cops>

COPS in Schools Award Announcement Round 1*April 23, 1999*

State	Name	Full-time Positions	Part-time Positions	Estimated Federal Funds
AK				
	North Slope, Borough of	1	0	\$120,000
		1	0	\$120,000
AL				
	Georgiana Police Department	2	0	\$161,868
	Muscle Shoals, City of	2	0	\$233,864
		4	0	\$395,732
AR				
	Bald Knob, City of	1	0	\$78,533
	Bentonville Police Department	1	0	\$103,923
	Bryant, City of	1	0	\$85,080
	Conway Police Department	1	0	\$100,681
	Monticello, City of	3	0	\$146,907
	Mountain Pine, City of	1	0	\$96,443
		8	0	\$611,567
AZ				
	Prescott, City of	1	0	\$125,000
	Wellton Police Department	1	0	\$103,079
		2	0	\$228,079
CA				
	Alameda County	5	0	\$625,000
	Clearlake Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Delano, City of	1	0	\$125,000
	Firebaugh Police Department	1	0	\$104,228
	Fresno County	14	0	\$1,750,000
	La Verne Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Oakdale Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Oceanside Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Placerville Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Red Bluff Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Reedley Police Department	1	0	\$125,000

State	Name	Full-time Positions	Part-time Positions	Estimated Federal Funds
	Santa Clara Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Scotts Valley Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Shasta County	4	0	\$500,000
	Soledad Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Sonora Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Tracy, City of	2	0	\$250,000
	Upland Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Visalia Police Department	5	0	\$625,000
	West Covina, City of	1	0	\$125,000
		45	0	\$5,604,228
CT				
	Enfield Police Department	3	0	\$375,000
	Manchester, Town of	3	0	\$375,000
	Old Saybrook Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Plainfield, Town of	1	0	\$125,000
	Suffield Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Wilton Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
		10	0	\$1,250,000
FL				
	Cape Coral Police Department	2	0	\$250,000
	Collier County Sheriff's Department	9	0	\$1,125,000
	Cooper, City of	1	0	\$125,000
	Flagler County Sheriff's Office	1	0	\$102,595
		13	0	\$1,602,595
GA				
	Catoosa County Sheriff's Department	2	0	\$213,422
	Haralson County Sheriff's Department	2	0	\$179,742
	Heard County Sheriff's Department	2	0	\$140,144
	Macon County Board of Education	2	0	\$238,960
	Polk County Police Department	3	0	\$281,544
	Villa Rica, City of	1	0	\$113,987
		12	0	\$1,167,799
IA				
	Centerville, City of	1	0	\$109,683
	Perry Police Department	1	0	\$125,000

State	Name	Full-time Positions	Part-time Positions	Estimated Federal Funds
	Sergeant Bluff, City of	1	0	\$110,135
	Woodbury County Sheriff's Office	2	0	\$250,000
		5	0	\$594,818
ID				
	Bonneville County	2	0	\$250,000
		2	0	\$250,000
IL				
	Alton Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Antioch Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Berkeley Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Bureau County Sheriff's Department	1	0	\$94,870
	Carbon Cliff Police Department	1	0	\$108,679
	Casey Police Department	1	0	\$118,529
	Clinton Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Effingham County Sheriff's Department	1	0	\$119,513
	Eldorado, City of	2	0	\$250,000
	Geneseo, City of	1	0	\$114,948
	Grayslake, Village of	1	0	\$125,000
	Jerseyville Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Lake Forest Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Marshall Police Department	1	0	\$105,718
	Mundelein Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Peoria Heights Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Silvis Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Skokie, Village of	1	0	\$125,000
	Sterling Police Department	1	0	\$123,174
	Washington Police Department	1	0	\$124,657
	Wheeling, Village of	1	0	\$125,000
		22	0	\$2,660,088
IN				
	Brownsburg Metropolitan Police Department	1	0	\$104,434
	Highland Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Ripley County Sheriff's Department	1	0	\$100,453
		3	0	\$329,887
KS				

State	Name	Full-time Positions	Part-time Positions	Estimated Federal Funds
	Andover, City of	1	0	\$109,385
	Atchison County Sheriff's Department	1	0	\$100,172
	Augusta Department of Safety	1	0	\$104,351
	Junction City	4	0	\$372,900
	Louisburg Municipal Police Department	1	0	\$97,911
	Spring Hill Police Department	1	0	\$116,722
	Unified School District 501	3	0	\$248,877
		12	0	\$1,150,298

KY

Albany Police Department	3	0	\$163,362
Boone County Sheriff's Department	0	4	\$71,198
Bowling Green, City of	2	0	\$250,000
Bullitt County Sheriff's Department	1	0	\$109,743
Cadiz Police Department	1	0	\$69,029
Dry Ridge, City of	1	0	\$80,874
Edgewood Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
Lebanon Police Department	1	0	\$75,763
Lexington Fayette Urban County Government	5	0	\$530,950
Louisa, City of	1	0	\$68,565
Ludlow Police Department	1	0	\$106,944
Menifee County Sheriff's Department	3	0	\$236,124
Montgomery County Sheriff's Department	1	0	\$79,686
Shepherdsville Police Department	3	0	\$167,097
Warren County Fiscal Court	1	0	\$104,314
	25	4	\$2,238,649

LA

Monroe Police Department	4	0	\$386,740
Rapides Parish	1	0	\$67,986
	5	0	\$454,725

MA

Acushnet Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
Amherst Police Department	1	0	\$103,300
Barnstable, Town of	1	0	\$109,899
Bridgewater Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
Foxborough Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
Framingham Police Department	1	0	\$125,000

State	Name	Full-time Positions	Part-time Positions	Estimated Federal Funds
	Granby Police Department	1	0	\$122,971
	Greenfield Police Department	1	0	\$108,210
	Haverhill	1	0	\$125,000
	Ludlow Police Department	1	0	\$122,599
	Methuen Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Newburyport Police Department	1	0	\$101,273
	Revere Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Somerset, Town of	1	0	\$125,000
	Swampscott Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Upton Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Uxbridge Police Dept., Town of	1	0	\$125,000
	Wakefield Police Department	1	0	\$124,371
		18	0	\$2,167,423
MD				
	Baltimore County Police Department	22	0	\$2,750,000
	Berlin Police Department	1	0	\$93,258
	Howard County Department of Police	9	0	\$1,125,000
	Wicomico County Sheriff's Department	4	0	\$416,600
		36	0	\$4,384,858
ME				
	Androscoggin County Sheriff's Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Bath Police Department	1	0	\$115,673
	Biddeford Police Department	2	0	\$250,000
	Brunswick Police Department	1	0	\$108,134
	Ellsworth Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Lisbon Police Department	1	0	\$115,843
	Oakland Police Department	2	0	\$222,588
	Orono, Town of	1	0	\$123,951
	South Berwick Police Department	2	0	\$226,624
	South Portland Police Department	2	0	\$250,000
	Wells Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	York, Town of	1	0	\$125,000
		16	0	\$1,912,813
MI				
	Adrian Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Belding Police Department	1	0	\$125,000

State	Name	Full-time Positions	Part-time Positions	Estimated Federal Funds
	Brighton Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Coldwater, City of	1	0	\$125,000
	Dewitt, Charter Township of	1	0	\$125,000
	Dowaglac Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Hastings Police Department	1	0	\$111,782
	Howell Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Kalkaska County Sheriff's Department	3	0	\$348,384
	Livingston County	1	0	\$125,000
	Marshall, City of	1	0	\$96,292
	Montrose, Township of	1	0	\$102,583
	Muskegon County Sheriff's Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Newaygo County Sheriff's Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Otsego County Sheriff's Department	2	0	\$250,000
	Portland, City of	1	0	\$125,000
	River Rouge, City of	2	0	\$250,000
	Troy, City of	1	0	\$125,000
		22	0	\$2,659,041

MN

Bemidji Police Department	1	0	\$102,967
Champlin Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
City of Warroad	1	0	\$100,718
Cold Spring Police Department	1	0	\$115,716
Glencoe Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
New Hope Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
St. Paul, City of	2	0	\$250,000
	8	0	\$944,401

MO

Breckenridge Hills, City of	2	0	\$239,600
Carl Junction, City of	1	0	\$125,000
Hallsville Police Department	1	0	\$83,462
Malden Police Department	1	0	\$86,282
Oak Grove Department of Public Safety	1	0	\$125,000
Osage Beach, City of	1	0	\$90,589
Republic Police Department	1	0	\$113,498
	8	0	\$863,431

MS

State	Name	Full-time Positions	Part-time Positions	Estimated Federal Funds
	Aberdeen, City of	2	0	\$134,182
	Guntown Police Department	1	0	\$49,738
	Marietta, Town of	1	1	\$93,683
	Newton County Sheriff's Department	1	0	\$85,637
	Pearl River County Sheriff's Department	2	0	\$210,332
	Petal Police Department	1	0	\$77,618
	Walthall County Sheriff's Department	2	0	\$145,030
		10	1	\$796,220
MT				
	Helena Police Department	4	0	\$454,808
	Kalispell Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
		5	0	\$579,808
NC				
	Duplin County Sheriff's Office	2	0	\$186,508
	Durham Police Department	10	0	\$1,075,680
	Garner Police Department	1	0	\$106,772
	Gaston County	2	0	\$216,956
	Grifton Police Department	1	0	\$82,345
	Orange County Sheriff's Department	4	0	\$483,268
		20	0	\$2,151,529
ND				
	Grand Forks Police Department	2	0	\$250,000
		2	0	\$250,000
NE				
	Washington County Sheriff's Department	1	0	\$87,259
		1	0	\$87,259
NH				
	Barnstead Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Derry Police Department	2	0	\$250,000
	Dover Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Farmington, Town of	1	0	\$125,000
	Goffstown Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Hudson Police Department	1	0	\$125,000

State	Name	Full-time Positions	Part-time Positions	Estimated Federal Funds
	Litchfield Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Swansey Police Department	1	0	\$123,090
		9	0	\$1,123,090

NJ

Bayonne Police Department	8	0	\$1,000,000
Brick, Township of	1	0	\$125,000
Bridgewater, Township of	1	0	\$125,000
Camden, City of	20	0	\$2,500,000
Ft. Lee Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
Harrison, Town of	1	0	\$125,000
Hawthorne, Borough of	2	0	\$250,000
Hillsborough, Township of	2	0	\$250,000
Kearny, Town of	1	0	\$125,000
Linden, City of	2	0	\$250,000
Little Egg Harbor, Township of	1	0	\$125,000
Medford, Township of	3	0	\$375,000
Montclair, Township of	2	0	\$250,000
Mountainside, Borough of	1	0	\$125,000
Mt. Holly Police Department	2	0	\$250,000
North Arlington, Borough of	1	0	\$125,000
North Wildwood Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
Orange Township, City of	1	0	\$125,000
Plainfield, City of	3	0	\$375,000
Ridgewood Police Department	1	0	\$101,793
Rockaway, Township of	2	0	\$250,000
Somerdale Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
West Deptford Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
West Orange Police Department	3	0	\$375,000
	62	0	\$7,726,793

NM

Aztec Police Department	1	0	\$119,491
Bernalillo, Town of	1	0	\$80,468
Corrales Police Department	1	0	\$120,000
Portales Police Department	1	0	\$93,293
	4	0	\$413,252

NY

State	Name	Full-time Positions	Part-time Positions	Estimated Federal Funds
	Addison Police Department	1	0	\$101,134
	Amsterdam, City of	1	0	\$125,000
	Cheektowaga, Town of	5	0	\$625,000
	Chemung County	1	0	\$125,000
	Elmira Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Gloversville Police Department	2	0	\$228,944
	Haverstraw, Town of	1	0	\$125,000
	Jamestown Police Department	4	0	\$500,000
	Port Byron, Village of	2	0	\$250,000
	Rochester Police Department	24	0	\$3,000,000
	Rotterdam Police Department	2	0	\$250,000
		44	0	\$5,455,078
OH				
	Barberton, City of	1	0	\$125,000
	Butler County Sheriff's Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Euclid, City of	1	0	\$125,000
	Greenhills, Village of	1	0	\$125,000
	Howland, Township of	1	0	\$125,000
	Jackson, Township of	0	2	\$112,311
	Madison, Township of	1	0	\$125,000
	Muskingum County Sheriff's Office	2	0	\$213,576
	Oregon Police Division	3	0	\$375,000
	Perry Ohio Police Department	1	0	\$107,221
	Riverside, City of	1	0	\$125,000
	Trumbull County Sheriff's Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Union County Sheriff's Department	2	0	\$238,409
	Weathersfield Township Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
		17	2	\$2,171,517
OK				
	Bartlesville Police Department	2	0	\$189,330
	Beggs, City of	1	0	\$55,820
	Coal County Sheriff's Department	1	0	\$52,782
	Edmond Police Department	3	0	\$364,063
	Grady County Sheriff's Department	2	0	\$170,566
	Prague, City of	1	0	\$67,580
	Stillwater, City of	3	0	\$302,522
		13	0	\$1,202,663

State	Name	Full-time Positions	Part-time Positions	Estimated Federal Funds
OR				
	Bend Police Department	2	0	\$250,000
	Coburg Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Deschutes County Sheriff's Department	3	0	\$375,000
	Gold Beach Police Department	1	0	\$124,767
	La Grande Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Malheur County Sheriff's Office	1	0	\$125,000
	Marion County Sheriff's Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Newberg, City of	1	0	\$125,000
	Troutdale, City of	3	0	\$375,000
		14	0	\$1,749,767
PA				
	Coal, Township of	1	0	\$84,247
	Corry, City of	1	0	\$117,049
	Duquesne Police Department	1	0	\$114,780
	Homestead, Borough of	0	2	\$25,919
	Munhall, Borough of	1	0	\$125,000
	South Abington, Township of	1	0	\$125,000
	Towamencin, Township of	1	0	\$125,000
	Uwchlan, Township of	1	0	\$125,000
	Whitehall, Township of	1	0	\$125,000
	Wilkes-Barre Police, City of	3	0	\$375,000
		11	2	\$1,341,995
SC				
	Conway Police Department	3	0	\$223,587
	Greenville, City of	4	0	\$430,956
	Mt. Pleasant, Town of	2	0	\$212,234
	Santee Police Department	2	0	\$168,450
		11	0	\$1,035,227
SD				
	Belle Fourche Police Department	1	0	\$108,460
		1	0	\$108,460
TN				
	Bolivar Police Department	2	0	\$131,932

State	Name	Full-time Positions	Part-time Positions	Estimated Federal Funds
	East Tennessee State	1	0	\$91,415
	Grainger County Sheriff's Department	2	0	\$129,431
	Martin Police Department	2	0	\$247,908
	Montgomery County Sheriff's Department	6	0	\$722,088
	Newbern Police Department	1	0	\$89,217
	Washington County Sheriff's Department	2	0	\$162,100
		16	0	\$1,574,091
TX				
	Allen Police Department	4	0	\$500,000
	Columbus, City of	1	0	\$90,771
	Conroe Independent School District	4	0	\$317,112
	Corpus Christi Independent School District	3	0	\$375,000
	Ector County ISD Police Department	5	0	\$463,405
	Ft. Bend County Sheriff's Department	3	0	\$375,000
	Lago Vista Police Department	1	0	\$102,203
	Mesquite, City of	1	0	\$121,448
	Mineola Police Department	1	0	\$105,265
	Plano Police Department	3	0	\$375,000
	Stanton Police Department	1	0	\$97,691
	Taylor Police Department	2	0	\$203,006
	Tyler County Sheriff's Department	1	0	\$90,815
	Uvalde Police Department	1	0	\$83,678
		31	0	\$3,300,394
UT				
	Grantsville, City of	1	0	\$125,000
	Sandy, City of	3	0	\$336,723
	Washington Terrace Police Department	1	0	\$124,443
		5	0	\$586,166
VA				
	Bedford, City of	1	0	\$101,180
	Botetourt County Sheriff's Office	1	0	\$108,245
	Falls Church, City of	1	0	\$125,000
	Grayson County Sheriff's Office	1	0	\$82,361
	Hopewell Bureau of Police	2	0	\$228,186
	Manassas Park Police Department	1	0	\$114,651
	Manassas, City of	1	0	\$122,564

State	Name	Full-time Positions	Part-time Positions	Estimated Federal Funds
	Orange Police Department	1	0	\$82,813
	Warren County Sheriff's Department	2	0	\$211,704
	Waynesboro Police Department	1	0	\$94,736
	Woodstock, Town of	1	0	\$97,535
		13	0	\$1,368,975
VT				
	South Burlington Police Department	1	0	\$111,388
	Winooski Police Department	1	2	\$113,528
		2	2	\$224,916
WA				
	Fife, City of	1	0	\$125,000
	Granger, Town of	1	0	\$82,665
	Kirkland, City of	2	0	\$250,000
	Mason, County of	1	0	\$125,000
	Reardan, Town of	1	0	\$91,353
	Soap Lake, City of	1	0	\$109,017
	Sultan Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Yakima County	1	0	\$125,000
	Zillah, City of	1	0	\$125,000
		10	0	\$1,158,035
WI				
	Adams County Sheriff's Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Brown County Sheriff's Department	2	0	\$250,000
	Calumet County Sheriff's Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Fall Creek Police Department	1	0	\$104,218
	Kohler Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Muskego Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Oak Creek Police Department	2	0	\$250,000
	Onalaska Police Department	1	0	\$125,000
	Twin Lakes, Village of	1	0	\$125,000
		11	0	\$1,354,218
WV				
	Ohio County Sheriff's Department	2	0	\$215,944
		2	0	\$215,944

State	Name	Full-time Positions	Part-time Positions	Estimated Federal Funds
WY				
	Powell Police Department	1	0	\$102,126
		1	0	\$102,126
Grand Total:		592	11	\$67,667,955

School Shooting Questions and Answers
April 22, 1999

- Q: We know the President has supported more police in schools and legislation to keep guns out of the hands of kids, but what has the Administration done to support more counselors and mental health professionals in the schools?**
- A:** One of the things that we learned from the various communities affected by school shootings last year was that they wanted more counselors in the schools and improved access to mental health care. That is why at last year's School Safety Conference the President launched the Safe Schools/Healthy Communities initiative. This initiative represents an unprecedented collaboration between the Departments of Justice, Education, and HHS that will allow 50 communities to receive up to \$3 million for each of the next three years if they adopt comprehensive, community-wide approaches to violence prevention. The program specifically links mental health and emotional development programs with more traditional school safety initiatives, in order to develop a comprehensive approach to this issue.

**Littleton School Shooting
Question & Answer
April 24, 1999**

Q: Mr. President, in your radio address today, you said that you would be sending new legislation to the Congress to keep guns out of the hands of children and to make schools safer. What more can you tell us about the proposals? And why are you sending them to Congress now?

A: First, let me say that the issue of youth violence, guns, and school safety is an area that we have been working on for some time now. And every year of my Administration we have fought to do more and more on these issues. We established the first safe schools program, banned the juvenile possession of handguns, and passed zero tolerance for guns in schools. We have significantly expanded afterschool programs, worked with law enforcement to trace many more crime guns to their source, and put more community police in our schools. And -- perhaps most importantly -- we have put the issue of gun violence at the center of our anti-crime efforts -- passing the Brady Law, the Assault Weapons Ban, and other meaningful firearms legislation that have resulted in gun-related violence dropping by more 25 percent since I took office. But as the shooting in Littleton reminds us: there are no quick and easy answers to this problem.

The bills I mentioned earlier today in my radio address are also something we have been working on for some time now -- and especially since the School Safety Conference last October. At the Conference, we talked about how to improve and strengthen our Safe and Drug-Free Schools program by developing more comprehensive strategies that get schools, law enforcement, mental health professionals, and juvenile justice authorities all working together to prevent violence and drug use. And we also learned from the communities that were impacted by school shootings last year, that the federal government could do even more to help respond to these tragic shootings -- as well as to help states develop their own response teams. So these are some of the things we will recommend in our new Safe and Drug-Free Schools legislation.

As for firearms legislation, as part of our 21st Century Crime Initiative we have been working on for some months, we have been considering new proposals to build on our existing efforts. Some of these you know already. For instance, we have proposed conducting background checks at all gun shows, and making permanent the waiting period requirements of the Brady Law. We have also proposed banning violent juveniles from owning guns when they turn 21, and providing child safety locks with every gun sold. But I will have more to say about these proposals in the coming days and weeks.

**PRESIDENT CLINTON:
HELPING TO KEEP OUR SCHOOLS SAFE**

April 23, 1999

"We must do more to keep guns out of the hands of children; to help our young people express their anger and alienation with words, not weapons; to prevent violence from shattering the peace of our schoolyards. By taking actions to prevent future acts of violence in our schools, we can best honor the memories of those who lost their lives."

President Bill Clinton
April 23, 1999

Today, at the White House, President Clinton announced new assistance for the community of Littleton, Colorado and added resources for communities to help keep students safe at school. Specifically, he announced (1) up to \$1.5 million in immediate funding from the Justice Department to assist the victims, their families, and the Jefferson County community with expenses relating to the Littleton school shooting; and (2) \$70 million in Justice Department grants to help fund more than 600 school resource officers in 336 communities across the country.

Expanding Assistance to Victims. In response to the recent tragedy at Columbine High School, and subsequent requests from Colorado authorities, the Justice Department will provide up to \$1.5 million in immediate funds from the Crime Victims' Fund to support:

- Direct compensation to victims and their family members for funerals, uncovered medical expenses, lost wages of parents, and private mental health counseling for victims;
- Additional personnel and overtime costs for critical incident stress management services for first responders to the crisis; and
- Added victims services and counseling personnel to help meet the immediate and longer-term support needs of the community.

Helping Schools Work with Law Enforcement to Prevent Crime and Violence. The President announced that the Justice Department COPS Office will release \$70 million to fund an additional 600 police officers in schools in 336 communities across the country. Today's announcement is the first installment in meeting the President's pledge made at the White House Conference on School Safety to provide funds for up to 2,000 officers in schools this fiscal year. In addition, the COPS Office is providing \$17 million through a School-Based Partnerships initiative. The funds will help strengthen partnerships between local law enforcement and schools, and help them to focus on school crime, drug use, and discipline problems. Schools have until the end of April to apply for these funds.

Promoting Comprehensive School Safety Strategies. The President urged communities to apply for funds through the Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative. This initiative will provide up to \$180 million this year -- and a total of \$380 million over the next three years -- to help 50 communities develop and implement violence prevention programs, such as establishing conflict resolution groups, hiring more mental health counselors, or installing security equipment. A product of the White House School Safety Conference, this initiative represents an unprecedented collaboration between the Departments of Justice, Education, and Health and Human Services to provide comprehensive educational, law enforcement, mental health, juvenile justice, and other services to help communities prevent youth violence and drug abuse, in and out of school. Communities have until June 1st to apply for funds under this initiative.

Distributing Additional Guides on the Early Warning Signs of Violence. Next week, the Departments of Justice and Education will distribute 150,000 additional copies of *Early Warning Timely Response: A Guide to Safe Schools*. The guide, written for teachers, principals, parents, and others who work with young people, provides information on how to identify and respond to the early warning signs of troubled youth that can lead to violence in schools. The guide also helps schools develop a crisis procedure checklist if violence occurs, and lists actions students can take to help make their schools safer. More than 200,000 guides have already been distributed to schools across the nation, and is available on the worldwide web at <http://www.ed.gov/offices/OSERS/OSEP/earlywrn.html>, or by calling 1-877-4ED-PUBS.



SUNTUM M @ A1
04/21/99 03:36:00 PM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

cc:

Subject: Lockhart briefing

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

April 21, 1999

PRESS BRIEFING BY
JOE LOCKHART

The Briefing Room

1:40 P.M. EDT

MR. LOCKHART: Let me take a couple of minutes at the top here to bring you up to date. I think as the President said this morning in reflecting some of his personal feelings about what the people of Littleton are going through, and also as far as from a federal government -- the support that we stand ready to offer, let me just go through a little bit of that.

As I said this morning, Secretary Riley has been in contact with the Jefferson County School Superintendent this morning to offer any assistance to the community, specifically the Secretary outlined our joint efforts, our interagency efforts between Education, Justice, Health and Human Services, to provide crisis counselors in particular and any other assistance that might be needed.

Additionally, Secretary Riley provided local officials with contact names and numbers for those officials seeking federal assistance throughout our government. They talked to a number of people nationwide who are expert on this, soliciting their help and have had a very good response.

Specifically, the Department of Education is working on offering the identifications of persons who can provide crisis

counseling assistance and payment to get those persons to Colorado; identification of persons who have experienced similar tragedies to provide hands-on help in the days immediately following this incident. Again, we can offer some assistance in paying for those people to travel and some assistance while they're there.

Identifications of persons who can help the school district plan for long-term recovery efforts, which the Department of Education is currently working on in the cases of Springfield, Oregon. Again, DOE can offer some assistance and financial assistance on that front.

Finally, identification of security experts. Often, in such a shooting or in such an incident like this, a school district will want to do a thorough security review of school safety plans, policies, et cetera. Again, the Department of Education stands ready to offer help on that front.

As far as at the Department of Treasury, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms provided 13 ATF investigators on the scene, in addition to two canine handlers and two explosive experts. ATF was asked by the county sheriff to assist in clearing the scene of explosive devices, and that was done with the help of ATF. Seven destructive devices were found in the trunk of one of the suspect's vehicles, and 12 small devices were found outside the school. ATF's crime scene mapping system has also been requested by the county sheriff.

ATF will also be involved in tracing firearms,

described as two sawed-off shotguns, one handgun and one carbine. In addition, ATF will help canvass explosive licenses in an effort to determine who purchased the explosives related to the incident. ATF will also send a peer support team, including two chaplains to provide services to victims, witnesses and investigators.

The Department of Justice, along with ATF, the FBI, agents are on the ground providing technical assistance to local law enforcement officials. They are not active in the investigation as it's considered a local effort at this point. Additionally, these agents may be able to provide assistance for added security to local hospitals as necessary.

FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the FEMA State Director is in touch with local officials to assess needs in dealing with the ongoing community relation initiatives. FEMA officials involved in the Jonesboro incident have been put in contact with the county sheriff in Littleton. These FEMA personnel will provide guidance and expertise as necessary to those in Littleton. Two FEMA public affairs officials will travel to Colorado to work with state and county officials.

And as far as the Department of Health and Human

Services, the HHS Center for Mental Health Services has contacted the Colorado State Mental Health Director to offer assistance with crisis counseling, if requested. In addition, the Surgeon General and his office stands ready to provide assistance if necessary.

Q Why doesn't the President condemn these guns? I know his attitude and so forth. But shouldn't he say again what it is to have such a proliferation of firearms in this country?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, I think the President has spoken very clearly in the past and will continue to about what we've already done to reduce the pervasiveness of guns, particularly with children, and what we need to continue to do.

I think in this particular case there's a lot we don't know, and I think there's a premium on not jumping to conclusions and not drawing conclusions from the facts that we do know. But there are a number of initiatives that are currently being put forward by the administration -- that we will have an omnibus crime bill that will include some of the things that we've

But for instance, the President has pushed for the Brady law extension. And let me emphasize that it's unclear that any of these would relate directly to the incident that we're going through now, but the Brady law extension would provide a three-day waiting period for handguns, which had lapsed last year.

The upcoming crime-related measures will eliminate the gun show exemption for the Brady law, which the President has talked about, a provision for a child to access -- holding adults criminally responsible for allowing easy access to guns, requiring gun dealers to provide a safety lock with every gun, a lifetime ban on possession for juveniles who commit violent crimes, and in our budget, there's more funds for ATF agents, more federal prosecutors and for more cities to do gun tracing.

Again, there may be further ideas we can look at as we move forward, and it's not completely clear based on the set of facts we have that any of this relates directly. But I think it's important that we continue to build on the initiatives that the President's talked about for the last six years.

Q Where are we at with a possible presidential visit to Littleton? And also, are the grief counselors that have been

discussed, are they federal grief counselors? Where do they come from and --

MR. LOCKHART: As Denver is one of the regional federal cities where there are regional offices for the federal government, we have a number of assets in that city who are federal employees.

And, in fact, the Department of Education, when we talked to them yesterday, remarked that some of the best people they have who specialize in crisis counseling are based in Denver.

Q These are federal grief counselors?

MR. LOCKHART: Yes. Well, they certainly -- they are people who work in recruiting people who can come in and do crisis counseling who are government experts. These are not federal people who spend --

Q The federal government is going to coordinate -- they're not federal.

MR. LOCKHART: Correct, yes.

Q And what about a trip?

MR. LOCKHART: I don't have any information on any travel. I think the President is obviously deeply concerned and shocked by the incident, as he expressed to you both last night and today, and if we find an appropriate way to go and help in the process that's ongoing there in a way that's not intrusive to the vast efforts that will have to transpire over the next few days, we'll try to do that.

Q Joe, the shooting seemed to have a lot of overtones of racism, and that area had problems with racism before -- not the school, perhaps, but problems of racism before. You're talking about dispatching a lot of federal efforts and agencies to this area. You haven't said anything about the new race office here at the White House to go help and to --

MR. LOCKHART: I think, again, let me just emphasize that we need to be careful about drawing any conclusions based on the incomplete information we have. And what we have now is incomplete information. As the information becomes more complete, if there is a federal asset that can be brought to bear to help the situation, to help in the situation, to help in the rebuilding effort that will need to be done there, both on a personal level with the families, communities and the school, we will do that.

Q There are eyewitnesses saying that people were shot because either they were jocks or because they were black or --

MR. LOCKHART: Let me just say that we are certainly aware of those reports, of those eyewitnesses' accounts. And if there are federal resources that can be brought to bear here, that can be positively contributed, we will certainly do that. But I don't, based on an incomplete picture of what transpired here, don't want to draw too many conclusions at this point.

Q Last night the President spoke of the danger of this year becoming another kind of wave of crimes, as there was

-- what can the President do, including a trip there, that would perhaps mitigate the possibility this would become a wave of additional school violence?

MR. LOCKHART: I think we've done, from the federal government's point of view, a lot on this effort, as far as trying to raise awareness about looking at the causes and looking at the availability of firearms for this kind of tragedy to happen.

But as the President said, we can never do enough. We always need to remain vigilant and talk to schools, talk to school administrators, talk to parents and have parents talk to their children. Again, we can't draw any conclusions at this point on the circumstances that led to this case. I think it would be counterproductive to try to understand, based on the limited information we have, as to why this has happened.

But I think the President is committed to continue the dialogue and the discussions we've had, and to continue to keep working hard at making sure that we're doing everything we can.

Q Would you discourage us from thinking that the President might be able to travel at anytime within the next 48 hours or before the NATO Summit?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, I think, as we always do, we'll provide you with the best information we can about his travel when those decisions have been made.

Q Joe, there is a lot of talk that television violence and particularly interactive games that are popular with young boys play a role in teen violence. Is the President looking at anything in that area?

MR. LOCKHART: I think, obviously, that's an area that has been discussed widely over the last few years and it's something that we're going to have to take a hard look at. Again, I can't -- I'm reluctant to draw any conclusions today based on the limited information we have, but it's a policy area that has gotten a lot of attention, both here in Washington and by experts around the country. I think if you go back and you look, there have been discussions in the past about this, and the First Lady has talked about this and the importance of reaching children and the importance of looking at the effect of things like interactive games and video games. And I think it's clearly something that deserves a look. But, again, I don't want to draw a straight line between that issue and the tragedy of yesterday, with the information we have.

Q Joe, to follow on that, the President spoke today about the need for parents to shield their children from violent images. Could you elaborate a little bit on what he might have been referring to today? Is it movies, is it videos, is it television shows? And, secondly, is that at all at odds with his close relationship that he has enjoyed with Hollywood?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, I think the President has spoken for those of you have followed him for the last five or six years about the importance of parents being involved with their children, talking to them, making sure that they know what they're watching, how they're reacting to it. That hasn't changed. And I don't see a connection between any relationship he has or may not have with someone in Hollywood.

He, I think, has spoken quite passionately on this subject. And it's, as he said here last night, it's something that we can never stop, we can never rest and say, okay, we've done enough here, because despite schools statistically and in relation to other places being a safe place, and despite all the work local communities have done, parents have done, the federal government has done to work on these problems, that there are limits and we should never be in the case where we think we've done enough -- because we can never do enough.

Q Joe, on that point, there are two different things you can do. One is to declare certain things illegal. Obviously, what they did yesterday was already illegal. The other thing that you seem to be talking about is a bully pulpit sort of function, to encourage people, the parents to talk to their kids, and school administrators to work with children who may be troubled and that sort of thing. To what extent does the White House look at this as a problem that requires legislation?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, I think you can look at part of this issue as something -- you know, the President has had strong views, strong legislative proposals, many of the provisions of which have been enacted and some that haven't, on juvenile justice and on assault weapons -- the assault weapons bans, the Brady Bill, which have had very positive results, I think, for our country. So this is a mix. There are legislative remedies we should never stop looking to see. We're doing everything we can.

But there is also, as you describe it, a bully pulpit function. I think the President has a unique role in bringing Americans together and in raising issues. And I think this is an issue that has consumed a significant amount of his time as far as trying to raise this issue. You will remember some months ago we had the White House Conference on School Safety where we brought experts from around the country together. And out of that, there were a number of efforts to provide communities with additional resources to address this, to provide them with an early warning system guide to address these issues. So I think it's a mixture of both things.

Q One thing you could say as you look back at all this is that you took action. On these other things, you've come up with ideas, people have talked about doing all of the things that you're now talking about doing, and still it doesn't prevent these things. Is there something that you see that you need do to that you haven't already done?

MR. LOCKHART: Again, I don't think we ever want to be in the position where we close ourselves off to ideas, to say we can't do more and we shouldn't do more. We have done -- I think the federal government has taken a lead role on this, working with state and local communities. There obviously are some limits, though, and I think we need to recognize that there's limits to what we need to do. But I think we shouldn't lose that it's hard to calculate or measure, with all the preventative work we've done, what we've prevented -- because we often can only focus on what we did not prevent or what we cannot prevent.

But I think what the President tried to communicate, both last night and today, is despite everything we've done, last night -- or yesterday -- tells us that we need to keep constantly looking at this and seeing if there is more we can do.

Q Well, Joe, all the communication that's gone back and forth between the administration and the local community, is there any sense, do you have an assessment of how well your previous efforts worked there? In other words, did Littleton get the handbook, did they use the handbook? Did they do any of the things that you have suggested --

MR. LOCKHART: I think the handbooks were distributed to schools throughout the nation.

Q Right, but I mean Littleton, specifically.

MR. LOCKHART: Right. We have not yet gotten into that level of conversation. I think there's some more immediate needs that the administrators there, the police force, have been dealing with. We will continue to deal with them on their most immediate needs and then there will be time, as we know more, to look at the issues that went into this, what led up to this. And it's an issue, at this point, that we don't know.

Q On a more general level, has there been any attempt since the White House conference and the handbooks have been distributed, to actually assess whether they've done more than just land on some principal's desk?

MR. LOCKHART: Let me leave it to -- I'm going to leave it to Secretary Riley to address that. I know he's been available and talking to people today. But I know from talking to them that this wasn't a situation where they just handed, you know, sent out a book and said, okay, you're on your own. There are ongoing efforts.

We have -- out of the conference, the President made several announcements. One is on hiring more, through the COPS program, hiring more school security officers. That has moved down the line. We are ready to make the grants on that. And also something like \$380 million in grants for school districts, for

comprehensive wide responses to school safety. The applications for that program have closed and the grants are ready to be made.

So we are moving forward with this. This isn't about -- this isn't a passive exercise. But, again, I can't, at this point -- and I'm not in a position to -- draw any conclusions based on the information we have.

Q Joe, this morning, the British Defense Minister said that troops will go in when the bombing has done its job. Is that a change in position on ground troops, and what exactly is on the table this weekend?

MR. LOCKHART: That is not a change, that's a reiteration of the policy. We say the job the bombs will do is result in one of two things: one is, Mr. Milosevic will change his calculation and come back with the view that the NATO demands are acceptable, or the balance of power on the ground will be changed significantly enough that he can impose his will in Kosovo. So that's just a reiteration --

Q -- that if the balance of power changes, that alone is sufficient for ground troops to go in there?

MR. LOCKHART: No. The balance of power will change, and he won't be able to impose his will against the will of the Kosovar Albanians. I'm not suggesting or going down, and I can't go down a hypothetical road of conditions down the road of whether or not ground troops will go in.

Q Before, this administration has said specifically that the only way that ground troops will go in is in a permissive environment --

MR. LOCKHART: And that is correct.

Q -- and you've defined a permissive environment --

MR. LOCKHART: And I don't have anything more to add on that.

Q There were also reports that NATO will discuss updating the assessment of deploying ground troops, which would be a step in that direction. Is NATO discussing --

MR. LOCKHART: Listen, I'm not sure that I would accept the premise of the argument. But let me say that we have said all along that we need to persist with this air campaign, that this is the option that we believe as we are highly confident will get us to our military objectives. And if we persist, we will prevail. We have also said that there was an assessment done late last year on ground troops in a non-permissive environment. That assessment can be updated based on changes on the ground as needed, and if the

SACEUR, the military command and the Secretary General want to update that assessment, that's something we would support.

Q The reports were that NATO was going to actively discuss asking Wesley Clark to update.

MR. LOCKHART: Those are reports. I'd put that question to the Secretary General's office, but again, I have not heard anything definitively on whether they want that updated.

Q Does the United States want those plans updated?

MR. LOCKHART: If the military command, the SACEUR and the Secretary General believe that it's prudent to update the assessment based on the changing circumstances on the ground, we would support that.

Q You've made it clear that Clark is running this war at the direction of NATO, so he's not in a vacuum doing this. I'm saying, does the United States want Clark to update the plans for ground troops?

MR. LOCKHART: I'm saying that if NATO, as a consensus organization, and the Secretary General in conjunction with the military command and General Clark believe that it's prudent to do that, we would support that.

Q Joe, your answer is -- I mean, forgive me, but implies a naivete that's not there about how NATO works. We're running this operation. If we say, Clark, you need to update your plans for ground troops, he'll do it. Do we want that to happen?

MR. LOCKHART: We believe that if the military command believes that if this is the right way to go and that it would be prudent for them to update, that is certainly something we'd support.

Q Do you see a decision on that coming out of the summit this weekend?

MR. LOCKHART: I can't predict.

Q Joe, you're saying two different things. If the military command wants it updated, well, sure, we'll let them. But then you say if NATO comes to a consensus -- NATO meaning the political leadership of NATO -- comes to a consensus, then they'll order, they'll tell the military command to update. Those are two different things.

MR. LOCKHART: They are not two exclusionary things, though. NATO and the NATO political alliance works closely with the military. We work and we talk back and forth; as a consensus organization we will continue to.

Q It would require a vote of the NAC?

Q Because when Shelton testifies on the Hill, he says we've been given explicit orders from our political leadership not to *pre-position or plan for ground troops* and so we're conducting the operation as they've told us to do it. Then we hear from the podium here and even from the President, well, nobody in the military command has asked us for ground troops, so we aren't giving it to them. I mean, somebody is in charge here, right?

MR. LOCKHART: Yes.

Q I mean, so it's fair to say that the political leadership has not asked the military command to plan for ground troops.

MR. LOCKHART: It is fair to say that.

Q If the military leadership wanted to update the plan, would they have to go to the NAC?

MR. LOCKHART: If the military leadership wanted to update any assessment, they would go to the Secretary General, there would be a *discussion*, and they will make a decision based on those discussions.

Q And all the member countries would vote?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, they'd be consulted. I don't know that there's a voting mechanism.

Q The Security General could ask on his authority, but it's really --

MR. LOCKHART: Yes.

Q And the United States would approve such a request from the Secretary General?

MR. LOCKHART: Let me repeat again, we would have no objection to updating the assessment that was done in October, I believe, of putting ground troops in. Now, let's understand what that means. That's looking to *see*, that's updating an assessment. That's not changing policy, it's not committing ground troops, should they go forward with this. It's looking at whether the problems that were evident when they looked at this October have somehow -- how they've changed, how we would address them, whether the situation would be more difficult, less difficult. That's what an assessment's for.

Q Could you explain why that isn't done constantly as a matter of course? Why aren't the assessments updated constantly? If you're not talking about changing policy or actually using them, why aren't assessments constantly being brought up to date?

MR. LOCKHART: Listen, you're asking me now to go beyond what my knowledge of this -- so I'd suggest that that be put to the able spokesman at NATO.

Q Do you agree with the part of the previous question that said the United States is really running this and not NATO?

MR. LOCKHART: NATO, as we all know, is a consensus organization of 19 democracies that make decisions based on a consensus; that this organization is strongly united in going forward with an air campaign that all 19 nations are highly confident will achieve our military objectives.

Q Joe, can you comment on the Holbrooke nomination and the latest problems with that?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, I don't have any independent information beyond what was in the news -- what has been in some newspaper reports. Let me say this. You all know how important the issue of Kosovo and Yugoslavia and the Balkans is. You should take some message of the diplomatic ability and faith that our national security team -- Secretary Albright, the President, Sandy Berger -- have in Mr. Holbrooke's ability that at crucial moments in this, in October and before the military campaign, we would entrust him to try to find a diplomatic solution.

This is a man of extraordinary diplomatic, intellectual ability. We are in a challenging time in our nation's history, as far as foreign policy challenges. The U.N. is an important post. I think we need to find a way to move this as quickly as we can and get Mr. Holbrooke into his position and confirmed at the U.N.

Q The U.S. has not paid dues --

MR. LOCKHART: That is a long-standing issue that we have worked very hard over the last few years to try to resolve, despite some differences in approach between those here at the White House and some on Capitol Hill.

Q You said we would not object to updating the assessment.

MR. LOCKHART: No, I didn't -- I said we would support, if the military -- if Solana and Clark believe that it would be prudent to update the assessment, we'd support that.

Q If that's where the impetus comes from -- you're saying the impetus for an updated assessment has to come from Clark to Solana? It can't come from defense ministers --

MR. LOCKHART: No. It can come from -- Solana represents the 19 NATO countries, and I'm just not going to get into

doing the interior plumbing of NATO here, only to say that if they move forward with this, it's something we support.

Q Separate and apart from whether Clark wants to do it, do we -- does the United States want those plans updated?

MR. LOCKHART: I think NATO is in the best position to make that decision. But, you know, having said that, it's certainly a prudent thing to do to keep your assessments updated, based on the situation.

Q How's the air war going?

Q Texaco has halted shipments of gasoline to Yugoslavia, Joe. Are you pressuring other oil companies to halt shipments?

MR. LOCKHART: I'm not aware that there's any -- that I know of that there is pressure on a particular oil company. We've discussed over the last few days a way of making sure that all of the important work that's being done by the NATO military campaign as far as stripping Milosevic of his ability to resupply isn't undone by oil, petroleum, lubricants coming in from the outside.

So, again, I'm not aware of particular issues as far as companies, but as we've said from here on several occasions, there is consensus within NATO that we do everything we can to cut off supplies of petroleum, oil, and lubricants.

Q Are any American companies involved in trading strategic materials with the Milosevic government?

MR. LOCKHART: Not that I'm aware of. But that's something that I'd have to look into. We have a U.N. embargo in place; we have talked a bit about the petroleum aspect of that, but I'm not aware of any.

Q Can you give us a little update on the air campaign, as you sometimes do? What's the latest?

MR. LOCKHART: I think that Mr. Shea and his Italian counterpart gave an update this morning. We continue to grind down, as the President said last week, the military machine of Milosevic and we will continue to do that until we prevail in this conflict.

Q Joe, are you concerned that if we asked for an updated assessment that it would appear that we we're moving towards ground troops? Is that why you're leaving this suddenly for Solana and Clark --

MR. LOCKHART: I'm not leaving anything suddenly. If you all want to do a seminar on how NATO works I'll be glad to bring someone in who can do that for you.

Q There are also reports that the UK supports updating this plan or supports moving towards ground troops. Will that be part of the discussion at the working dinner between the Prime Minister and the President tonight?

MR. LOCKHART: I think that there will be -- they'll discuss all aspects of this. I don't want to rule anything in or out, and I'll let you know.

Q May I ask two questions, please -- first, on NATO. I know it's a consensus organization as you say, but isn't the U.S. first among -- doesn't the U.S. have greater weight than the other countries?

MR. LOCKHART: I think the U.S. is obviously, given the contributions we make, a very important part of the Alliance, but I'm not going to get into weighing whose vote counts for what.

Q On the school shootings, what do you say to those countries that observe us from afar and say the U.S. is such a violent nation that it really has not business dictating to other countries?

MR. LOCKHART: I would say if anyone tried to compare the tragedy that unfolded yesterday with circumstances that we don't fully understand yet with the brutality of President Milosevic and what he's done to Kosovo, that would be the most insane idea I have heard in a long time. We have, from time to time, incidents here that are hard to explain that we need to work very hard to address. But the brutal expulsion of a million -- up to a million people, the killing, the pillaging, the raping -- that's something that no decent human being could ever explain.

Q But, Joe, didn't the President compare Milosevic's ethnic cleansing to that man who was dragged to death down in Texas, and also, too, that gay man who was beaten to death --

MR. LOCKHART: I think the President has clearly said that one of the things that bedevils us at the end of this century is people who define themselves by who they're not, and the ethnic hatreds that we see around the world. Again, I think trying to compare an isolated case in this country to what we see in Kosovo and what we see in other parts of the world just is beyond the pale.

Q Joe, if the NATO military commanders thought it was prudent to pre-position ground forces in case they were needed in the future, since it takes some time to get them into place, is that something that the United States would support?

MR. LOCKHART: If they thought that was the case and they made that point, it would be discussed within NATO. They have not, so I can't answer the question.

Q The United States, President Clinton has said that

we'll make whatever resources are available or are needed by General Clark are available to him. Why are we still mulling over whether or not the aircraft carrier Enterprise ought to be dispatched to that region, and why are we still mulling over the 300 aircraft requests?

MR. LOCKHART: Let me leave that for the Pentagon to discuss, because I don't have any operational details on either of those two areas.

Q Joe, I hate to keep on coming back to the subject, but you just opened up this can of worms again. You said if NATO military commanders wanted to pre-position, we'd discuss it, but they haven't suggested that. But Shelton, when he was up on the Hill the other day, said we've been explicitly told not to pre-position by our political leaders. And we shouldn't -- you're suggesting that somehow if they would just come to you with a suggestion --

MR. LOCKHART: I am not suggesting that by any means, so I can't respond to the question.

Q Well, you just said if they wanted --

MR. LOCKHART: No, I said they certainly could find a way to put on the table any issue they want that would be part of a NATO discussion.

Q But Shelton said they've been told not to have it on the table.

MR. LOCKHART: Well, I am not aware of that being said. I'd have to look at what he said explicitly, because I don't believe that that's the case.

Q You're expecting the --

MR. LOCKHART: I don't have any indication that that comes today. If it does, we'll let you know.

Q Does the President have any special things he wants to talk to Blair about?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, I think we have a very important summit coming up which will deal with a wide range of NATO issues important to the United States and the UK. I expect them to have a serious discussion about the situation in Yugoslavia and Kosovo, the ongoing military campaign there, as well as there are some other bilateral issues that may come up.

Q Has the administration received its briefing on the CIA review of the Chinese espionage investigation? And if that's the case, do you believe that you're backed up in your contention you did everything in a timely fashion?

MR. LOCKHART: I believe there are some who got a preliminary briefing this morning. I think the President will be

briefed later this afternoon by his National Security Advisor, so I'm going to withhold any comment until that has happened. I do expect, though, once that briefing is done we'll find a way to say something -- whether it be a piece of paper or something. So that should come later today.

Q What about making the report public, Joe?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, the report is classified.

Q Is there not a process ongoing with the committee to --

MR. LOCKHART: There's a Cox committee report that is well along the way to being -- much of it being declassified so it can be made public. This is a different assessment, which is highly classified, and I don't believe will be declassified. But members of the appropriate committees on the Hill will be briefed on it.

Q If I could just wrap that up, what about the Cox committee report? Any idea when that might be made public?

MR. LOCKHART: I don't have an exact date. I know that they're well along in the process. The administration has worked very well with the Hill and I think agencies have. There were a few remaining issues that they're working through and when they're done it will be made public.

Q Is he having a foreign policy briefing this afternoon?

MR. LOCKHART: No.

Q A battalion of the 82nd Airborne was sent to Albania, but there was no announcement from the Pentagon that these troops were being dispatched, and I don't believe any announcement from here. Was there any reason?

MR. LOCKHART: Any announcement of deployment would come from the Pentagon, so I would refer you to the Pentagon with the question.

Q There was no announcement. Is there any reason --

MR. LOCKHART: I'd ask you to ask the question there about that.

Q Joe, has President Clinton talked to Kweisi Mfume recently about a potential run for mayor of Baltimore --

MR. LOCKHART: Not that I'm aware of.

Q Is the President, is he aware of the situation?

MR. LOCKHART: I'm not aware of it, so if he is, he hasn't made me aware of it.

Q Okay. Well, Kweisi Mfume said yesterday that he is seriously considering running for mayor of Baltimore. What would this do for the administration, since it worked so well with --

MR. LOCKHART: Well, let me say this. I think Mr. Mfume did an excellent job in Congress, particularly in his leadership within the Congressional Black Caucus. He's done an excellent job at the NAACP. I'm not aware that he has any future plans. But whatever they are, I'm certain his past record will mean that he'll be very successful in whatever venture he goes for in the future. As far as speculating about political campaigns, I think I'll resist that temptation.

Q Joe, I think some of the confusion with this earlier stuff is that the military campaign is an air campaign, so issues related to ground troops -- whether it's pre-positioning them or updating plans for them -- is essentially a political decision. So why would the White House be saying that they might want offers on what is essentially a political issue from its military commanders?

MR. LOCKHART: The White House is not saying that. I'm just saying that we work, and NATO works, within the political context with Secretary General Solana, who also works with the Supreme Allied Commander. And as clearly as I can say, if NATO wants and sees that it's prudent to update any assessment that's been done, we would agree and we would say that it is prudent to do that and support that.

Q Why would it be prudent? Why would it be helpful at this point to update that assessment?

MR. LOCKHART: When you're in a military campaign things change on the ground; it's always good to know -- it's always good for your assessments to be up to date.

Q Joe, housekeeping. Are you planning to brief all weekend, and will you start briefing Friday over at the Reagan Building?

MR. LOCKHART: I think, as far as housekeeping goes, there's an excellent schedule that I'm reading now that will tell me what I'll be doing. Friday I think we'll be at the Amphitheater of the National Trade Center. I think, logistically, the way it will work is I'll be available with some of our senior national security people sometime Friday afternoon. I'll be over there on Friday and available most of the time to the pool for anything that may be changing or breaking.

I think the NATO operation will be doing their normal 9:00 a.m. Eastern Time briefing that you all have become accustomed

to that has been going on from Brussels, but will take

place here. And then there will be various briefings through the day.

I think we'll -- I need to remind you of a couple of things. One is that you do need your NATO credential to access the facilities there. Once you're in there, there will be a lot of helpful people to let you know where to go and where to stand and what to pay attention to -- which you'll probably ignore, but that's, so be it.

Secondly, on Friday and Saturday, the Northwest Gate closes at 6:30 p.m., because of all of the different arrivals and issues. So if you need to be in here, you need to be in here by 6:30 p.m. and you need to be able to stay here, rather than come and go as you normally do.

Q What about the Southwest Gate?

Q No, the Northwest. Which --

MR. LOCKHART: Northwest. The gate that you normally come into.

Q We can't leave after 6:30 p.m.?

MR. LOCKHART: No, you can leave. You can leave. You just can't get back in through the Northwest Gate.

Q Or Southwest?

Q But we can get in through Southwest, right?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, let me have someone look at it. My note here just says you can't get in through the Northwest Gate.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END 2:20 P.M. EDT

#79-04/21

Message Sent To:



U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Community Oriented Policing Services

Communications Division

1100 Vermont Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20530

FAX COVER SHEET

TO: Leanne

DATE:

FAX#: (202)

FROM: Dan Pfeiffer
Public Affairs Specialist

PAGES:

Phone: (202) 616-1728
Fax: (202) 616-5899

COPS in Schools & Schoolbased info
Solicitations & a copy of our ^{tonight} School Safety
brochure. If you need me feel free to
page me (574-5000). Lets talk tomorrow about
what you need.

Thanks,
Dan

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Community Oriented Policing Services



Application

www.usdoj.gov/cops/

COPS in Schools Application Addendum

Program Information

To help hire community policing officers to work in schools, the COPS Office is offering up to \$60 million to local law enforcement agencies. The COPS in Schools initiative provides an incentive for law enforcement agencies to build working relationships with schools to use community policing efforts to combat school violence. The COPS in Schools initiative reduces the local match requirement for law enforcement agencies seeking to hire additional officers in and around schools.

Grants will be awarded to provide for the salary and benefits of each new officer over three years up to \$125,000 per officer; any remainder is paid with state or local funds.

To be eligible to receive funding under this grant program, applicants must:

- Be eligible to receive funding under the current guidelines established for the Universal Hiring Program (UHP).
- Provide assurance that the officers employed under this program will be deployed to work in or around primary or secondary schools.
- Enter into a partnership agreement with an official for a specific school or school district with general educational oversight authority in the jurisdiction.
- Provide a written plan to retain their COPS-funded officer positions after federal funding has ended. This plan must be submitted to the COPS Office with the application, along with supporting documentation.

In addition to these general program requirements, agencies seeking funding under this program will also be asked to provide supporting documentation in the following areas:

- **Problem Identification and Justification:**

For Example:

Problem Identification: Gang Violence adjacent to or within schools.

Justification: Documentation such as crime data, information on the number of gang members in a particular school, number of suspensions and expulsions related to gang activities, school survey, complaints from community, etc.

- **Community Policing Strategies to be used by the Officers:**

Examples include conflict/dispute resolution, at-risk intervention, mentoring activities, gang mediation, problem solving projects, truancy programs, etc.

- **Quality and Level of Commitment to Program:**

Examples include the amount of dedicated officer hours deployed to school activities, the duration and quality of the proposed program, evidence of previous successes and a description of the impacted or targeted areas.

- **Link to Community Policing:**

Agencies seeking funding under this program must provide information on how the proposed activities under this program link to their overall organizational community policing strategy.

Please attach a narrative statement that will address the program requirements that are mentioned above. This information must be signed by the Law Enforcement Executive and the School Agency Official.

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Community Oriented Policing Services



COPS Application

School-Based Partnerships '99

School-Related Crime Prevention and Safety Initiative

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Community Oriented Policing Services
Joseph E. Brann, Director

OMB approval 1103-0034
Expiration 4/30/99

Important Information

Who may apply?

Policing agencies (or consortiums of policing agencies) that are interested in working together with schools or community-based entities to address a persistent school-related crime or disorder problem in an innovative way.

Are partnerships required under this project?

Yes. To be eligible for funding, a law enforcement agency must apply in partnership with either a specific school or a nonprofit, community-based group. A partnership between a policing agency and a school is encouraged, but if such a partnership is not practical, a policing agency may partner with a nonprofit, community-based group. Appropriate school-based partners could include the entire school district, a specific school, the school administration or the PTA. Appropriate community-based entities could include social service providers, civic and municipal agencies, neighborhood associations, nonprofit health organizations, community coalitions, or faith groups. Student representation also must be incorporated into the project, in addition to the school or nonprofit, community-based group. Appropriate student representatives could include student government members, members of a student club or organization, or students who will serve on a working group developed specifically for this grant project. A Collaboration Agreement must be signed by the policing agency, the partner and a student representative. For assistance in developing a Collaboration Agreement see p. 53 of the Application Forms.

What will the problem-solving projects funded under this program accomplish?

During the course of this 12-month grant program, grantees will work with their partners and other interested parties to analyze a crime or disorder problem, implement tailored responses, and assess the impact of these responses.

We do not know enough yet about the crime problem we've chosen to address in order to propose responses to the problem. Can we still apply?

Yes, you can still apply. You are not expected to describe any anticipated responses to the problem you've selected at this time. But to be considered for funding, you must select a problem and develop a plan for analyzing it. The application will help guide you in the development of your analysis plan. Responses to this problem should not already be decided at this time.

What is the focus of this grant program?

This grant program emphasizes problem analysis, which will help you develop effective, tailored responses to a problem, including prevention and intervention efforts of all types. As a result, the ultimate focus of this grant program is quite expansive. For example, a problem analysis might show that 80 percent of assaults on students at a particular school are committed by truant students with prior arrest records from

other schools. A comprehensive response to this problem might involve a collaborative effort among a team of social services personnel, school administrative staff and probation officers. This multidisciplinary team might work together to change policies and improve communication in order to exert more control over the offenders and problem behaviors. Similarly, other responses may include training for students in conflict resolution, crime awareness/prevention programs, restorative justice/community justice initiatives, programs targeted at likely victims and offenders at high-risk times, social service intervention programs, physical changes in environmental features to reduce the problem, and school policy and procedural changes.

Although this grant program is focused on the careful analysis of a specific school-related crime problem, it is not intended to be overly complex or technical. Applicants are not expected to be experts in problem solving or crime analysis but must demonstrate an understanding of basic problem-solving techniques (see "Problem-Solving Tips" for background on the problem-solving approach). Any organization concerned with school safety or crime issues is encouraged to participate in a school problem-solving effort. Applicants that would like assistance in conducting comprehensive problem analyses and developing tailor-made responses during the course of their projects are encouraged to set aside funds for such technical assistance in their project budgets.

What will the grant pay for?

This program will fund resources that enhance a community's ability to do creative problem solving — particularly those that help policing agencies and their partners analyze problems and assess the impact of responses. Such resources may include computer technology to support information systems, crime analysis personnel and other research staff, stipends and/or overtime for teachers and students who work on the project, and community organizers. Other resources may include funds for publications on problem solving, student and faculty surveys, victim/offender interviews, and other research and assessment tools. In addition, allowable resources include training and technical assistance in collaborative problem solving, crime prevention through environmental design, situational crime prevention, and other related topics. A full listing of allowable resources can be found on p. 18 of the Application Instructions. The policing agency, partnering entity and student representatives are all eligible to receive any allowable resources under this program.

Can my agency submit more than one application?

Each policing agency may apply only once and must be the lead or primary applicant. Law enforcement agencies must apply in partnership with either a specific school or a nonprofit, community-based group. A partnership between a policing agency and a school or school district is encouraged, but if such a partnership is not practical, a policing agency may partner with a nonprofit, community group.

Is there an evaluation requirement?

Yes. At least 5 percent of an applicant's total project budget must be set aside for evaluation purposes. The evaluation should focus on assessing the project's impact on the targeted crime or disorder problem. Applicants are encouraged to contract with a local university or college to fulfill the evaluation requirement.

Are there any additional requirements?

Yes. Each agency should include money in their proposed budget for travel (for three people) to the COPS conference that will be held during the course of the grant program. Each agency also is encouraged to set aside 5 percent of their budget for training and technical assistance specifically aimed at enhancing the analysis and the response phases of the project. More information regarding the types of training and technical assistance that are available will be provided at a later date.

What do I need to submit to be considered for funding?

There are six components in a complete School-Based Partnerships grant application:

1. **Project Application** (Application Forms, p. 37-52) These forms include:
 - Background Information;
 - Problem Selection;
 - Project Description; and
 - Partner(s) (Secondary Applicants).
2. **Collaboration Agreement.** The Collaboration Agreement (CA) explains the nature of the relationship between project partners (the primary and secondary applicants). For additional information on specific points in a CA, please refer to p. 53 in the Application Forms.
3. **Budget Detail Worksheet** (Application Forms p. 55)
4. **Administrative Forms** (Application Forms p. 67) Please carefully read the Certifications and Assurances forms and sign both of these forms to indicate your compliance with these requirements. Those jurisdictions that have reportable lobbying activities also are required to sign and return the Disclosure of Lobbying Activities form (see the back of this form to determine whether your activities are "reportable"). At least one copy of these administrative forms submitted to the COPS Office must have original signatures.
5. **One original application and two copies.** Three separate sets — each containing all four Project Application sections, a Collaboration Agreement, a completed Budget Detail Worksheet and the Administrative Forms described above — must be submitted to the COPS office. Faxed copies of the application will not be accepted.

What is the length of the grant award?

Grants will be for 12 months. The COPS Office will consider no-cost extensions of the grant period to allow additional time for the budget review process and the completion of all phases of the project.

What are the amounts of the grant awards?

There is no cap on the amount that may be requested under this grant program. However, requests must be commensurate with the scope of the proposed project. We anticipate that most grant awards will average between \$100,000 and \$150,000.

What is the deadline?

April 30, 1999. Applications postmarked after April 30, 1999, will not be considered for funding.

Submit an original application and two copies to:

School-Based Partnerships '99
COPS Office
1100 Vermont Avenue, NW
8th Floor
Washington, DC 20530
(For overnight delivery, please use 20005 as the zip code.)

Faxed copies of the application will not be accepted.

Who can I contact for more information?

The U.S. Department of Justice Response Center at 1-800-421-6770 or your COPS grant advisor.

Foreword

Across our nation, law enforcement officials and private citizens have embraced community policing by creating partnerships that address local needs through innovative problem-solving strategies. The result: safer streets, less fear and a better quality of life for everyone.

This connection between problem solving and partnerships is the focus of the School-Based Partnerships application. Crime reduction measures are more effective when the two concepts are integrally linked. Problem solving that doesn't involve community partnerships often results in the wrong focus for scarce police resources, and partnerships that lack a problem-solving focus will not significantly reduce crime.

Policing agencies and communities rarely have the opportunity or the resources to effectively study a problem before responding to it. There is much pressure to "do something" right away, even though quick fixes rarely work in the long run. The School-Based Partnerships initiative offers an opportunity for policing agencies and their community partners to analyze problems and develop effective and lasting solutions.

For the past four-and-a-half years, the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services has awarded grants to hire or redeploy more than 80,000 officers to support and advance community policing nationwide. School-Based Partnerships represent the next phase in this effort by encouraging the kind of innovative thinking needed to solve the complex school-related problems communities find themselves facing today.

To aid you in completing the application, we have included a guide called "Problem-Solving Tips" in this application kit. This guide provides background information on most of the questions in the application and on the problem-solving process. It also lists and describes a number of resources that will help you in addressing your crime problem.

On behalf of the U.S. Department of Justice and the COPS Office, I look forward to receiving your application. Thank you for your continued interest in community policing and for your commitment to making a difference in your communities.

Joseph E. Brann
Director, Office of Community Oriented
Policing Services

Glossary of Terms

The following definitions may assist you in completing this grant application:

Collaboration Agreement (CA)

An agreement written and signed by the policing agency and their partners — the school district, a school or the community-based partner, and a student representative — outlining the roles and responsibilities to be undertaken by each for the proposed project.

School

A partnering school can be either a public or private institution serving students grades K-12 or a school district. Appropriate groups that could serve as the school-based partner could include: the principal's office, the PTA, a school advisory council or a group of school employees organized specifically for the project. A partnership between a policing agency and a school is encouraged, but if such a partnership is not practical, a policing agency may partner with a nonprofit community group.

Cognizant Federal Agency

Your Cognizant Federal Agency is generally the Federal agency that provides you with the most Federal money. Your Cognizant Federal Agency may have already been assigned to you by the Office of Management and Budget. If this is the first grant that your agency receives, the U.S Department of Justice would be your Cognizant Federal Agency.

Community-Based Entity

This term is meant to include nonprofit organizations, social service providers, and civic and municipal agencies. Specific examples of community-based entities include parent support groups, nonprofit health organizations, neighborhood associations, municipal agencies, faith organizations and community coalitions.

Focus School

The focus school includes school grounds, as well as adjacent areas that are affected by the specific problem, such as common paths students take to get to and from school. The focus school, or specific area where the problem is occurring, must be identified in the application. Information about the focus school or identified area is requested on p. 38 of the Application Forms.

ORI Number

The Originating Agency Identifier (ORI) number is assigned by the FBI as a law enforcement agency identifier. The first two letters are your state abbreviation, the next three numbers are your county's code, and the final two numbers identify your jurisdiction with your county. If your agency does not have an ORI number assigned by the FBI, the COPS Office will assign a nonofficial ORI code to use as an agency identifier.

Primary Applicant

The policing agency (or consortium of policing agencies) is always the primary applicant. Policing agencies include municipal, county, housing, transit, school police departments (consisting of officers with sworn authority), Indian tribal police departments and sheriffs' departments. Each primary applicant may submit only one application under this program.

Partner (Secondary Applicant)

Partners for this grant program will be either a specific school, school district or a community-based entity that will be an official collaborator for the purposes of this grant.

Part I Index Crimes

The FBI counts the following offenses as Part I Index crimes: murder, non-negligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft and arson.

Supplanting

For the purpose of your COPS grant, supplanting means to use Federal COPS funds to replace state or local funds which otherwise would have been spent on law enforcement purposes. You are prohibited from supplanting throughout the award period, which means that you may not use COPS funds to pay for anything that otherwise would have been purchased with state or local funds in the absence of the COPS program. COPS funds instead must be used to supplement your budget.

Ven Number / EIN Number / Vendor number

This number is usually your agency's Federal identification number as assigned to you by the IRS. In some cases, the EIN has been previously assigned to another agency within your jurisdiction. In that instance, a new vendor number will be assigned to you by the Office of the Comptroller. The new assigned vendor number is to be used for grant administration uses only and should not be used for IRS purposes.

Introduction

The COPS Office

Established on October 1, 1994, under the Public Safety Partnership and Community Policing Act of 1994, the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) has four primary goals:

- To increase the number of community policing officers on the beat by 100,000;
- To promote the implementation of departmentwide community policing in law enforcement agencies across the country;
- To help develop an infrastructure that will institutionalize and sustain community policing after Federal funding has ended; and
- To demonstrate and evaluate the ability of agencies practicing community policing to significantly improve the quality of life by reducing the levels of violence, crime and disorder in their communities.

The COPS Office is almost three-quarters of the way toward reaching its first goal of adding 100,000 police officers to America's streets. Three-and-a-half years after its inception, the COPS Office has provided funding for American police agencies to hire or redeploy more than 92,000 additional officers. To continue to promote the implementation of departmentwide community policing, to help law enforcement agencies institutionalize community policing and to significantly improve public safety levels in communities across the nation will require a continued investment by the Federal government, policing agencies, communities, and other state and local government agencies.

Community Policing

The COPS Office defines community policing in the following way:

Community policing is a policing philosophy that promotes and supports organizational strategies to address the causes and reduce the fear of crime and social disorder through problem-solving tactics and community-police partnerships.

Departments that practice community policing work with community members to identify persistent community problems, learn more about why these problems occur, and address the underlying conditions that precipitate these problems to prevent crime where possible.

Eligibility

Any local, Indian tribal, school district police department (consisting of officers with sworn authority) or other public law enforcement agency committed to the philosophy of community policing and to innovative programs to reduce crime, violence and the fear of crime, is eligible to apply under this competitive program as the primary applicant. Law enforcement agencies must partner with either a school, school district or community-based entity (secondary applicant). Only one application may be submitted per primary applicant.

Schools, school districts or community-based entities committed to the philosophy of community policing and to innovative programs to reduce crime, violence and the fear of crime are eligible to apply under this competitive program as the partner (secondary applicant).

Any award made under this grant program will not affect the eligibility of an agency or organization to apply to other COPS programs for which they might be

eligible in the future. Applicants are encouraged to complement resources granted under other programs — such as COPS MORE, Community Policing to Combat Domestic Violence, Universal Hiring Program, COPS FAST, COPS AHEAD, and Advancing Community Policing — with resources requested under this grant program. (Please note, however, that each grant must be managed separately with respect to programmatic and financial requirements.)

How to Apply

1. Read through this set of Application Instructions then review the Application Forms. It is also strongly recommended that applicants read the companion document to this application, "Problem-Solving Tips: A Guide to Reducing Crime and Disorder Through Problem-Solving Partnerships."
2. Choose one of the crime or disorder problems listed on pages 41 and 42 of the Application Forms.
3. Identify potential partner(s) in the problem-solving effort.
4. Complete the Application Forms. A summary of the components in a complete application can be found in the Overview and Introduction section of this application kit.
5. Send one original application and two copies to the COPS Office by April 30, 1999. Faxed copies of the application will not be accepted. Applications must be postmarked by the due date.

Funding Information

This is an extremely competitive program. Most grant awards will average between \$100,000 and \$150,000. Grant awards are 12 months in duration. Although a local match is not required

for this grant program, applicants are encouraged to contribute cash or in-kind resources to their proposed projects.

Evaluation Requirements

All grantees under this program will be expected to evaluate their activities. Grantees are required to collect information regarding the achievements and successes of their projects, as well as the obstacles they encountered during the course of their projects. At least 5 percent of an applicant's total grant budget must be allocated to a local evaluation effort administered by the grantee. This evaluation should focus on assessing the project's qualitative and quantitative impact on the targeted crime or disorder problem. (See the example Budget Detail Worksheet on p. 25 of the application for a brief description of an evaluation effort.) Additional information on the local evaluation requirement will be forwarded to grantees after awards have been made.

In addition to the grantee-administered evaluations noted above, a national evaluation and a number of local-level evaluations may be conducted of this grant program. The purpose of these evaluations will be to assess the implementation of this program, as well as examine the impact of the program on crime and disorder. Evaluators may visit grantee sites to collect data for these evaluations. All selected applicants must agree to cooperate in these efforts and participate in providing any requested information.

Anticipated Outcomes

This initiative is aimed at police and sheriffs' departments and individual schools, school districts or community-based entities that are interested in working together to creatively tackle a persistent school-related problem in a

new way. In particular, the COPS Office seeks proposals that will help agencies solve school-related problems beyond the life of the grant. Anticipated project outcomes include:

- An increased ability of policing agencies, schools and community groups to gather and analyze useful and timely information about crime and disorder problems;
- An increased ability of policing agencies, schools and community groups to work together in developing innovative, systemic, long-term approaches to reducing and preventing different kinds of crime and disorder in and around their schools;
- Measurable impacts on the targeted crime and disorder problems, an improved quality of life for those affected (students, teachers, school personnel, parents), decreased fear of crime and violence among students, school employees and community members; and
- An increased body of knowledge for communities, criminal justice researchers and practitioners on the creative approaches being employed by different schools and community-based entities to address specific school-related crime problems. Grantees may be asked to participate in a series of regional meetings showcasing innovative efforts and successful problem-solving initiatives. Grantees also may be asked to compile brief reports describing their problem-solving efforts. A number of these reports will be disseminated nationally to COPS grantees and to others interested in model problem-solving efforts.

The Problem-Solving Approach

Traditionally, police have handled each incident or call for service as a separate and fairly unique occurrence. For example, most commercial burglaries have been addressed individually: an officer has taken a report from the victim and attempted to identify the offender and recover stolen property. The responding officer also might have counseled the victim in general crime prevention techniques and attempted to link a series of commercial burglaries to one offender. But the incidents have not typically been analyzed as a group to learn why and how the crimes have occurred repeatedly, and how they could have been prevented. This grant program seeks to build on the problem-solving approaches many communities have used in recent years to address school-based crime and disorder problems. These approaches involve analyzing groups of related incidents that comprise a specific crime problem so that comprehensive, tailored strategies to prevent future crime can be developed. These problem-solving strategies rely less on increasing patrol presence or arresting offenders and more on developing long-term ways to divert offenders, protect likely victims and make crime locations less conducive to problem behaviors.

The emphasis on problem solving as an effective policing strategy stems from pioneering work on problem-oriented policing done by Herman Goldstein in the late 1970s and from experiments in the early 1980s in Madison, Wisconsin; Baltimore County, Maryland; and

Newport News, Virginia. In Newport News, police practitioners, working in concert with researchers and community members, demonstrated that crime and disorder problems could be significantly reduced by implementing tailored responses directly linked to the findings of comprehensive problem analyses. Police and community members in Newport News were able to reduce burglaries in a targeted apartment complex by 34 percent, reduce prostitution-related robberies in the target district by 39 percent and reduce thefts from vehicles in two downtown areas by over 50 percent.¹ From this effort and other early work on problem-oriented policing, community policing advocates recognized the effectiveness of the problem-solving approach and incorporated it into the community policing philosophy.

Since the mid-1980s, communities of all sizes and policing agencies of all types — including sheriffs' departments, state police, highway patrols and transit police — have successfully used the problem-solving approach to address an endless variety of problems. From these efforts, it has become clear that problem solving is critical to the success of community policing efforts. Initiatives that lack an analytical component often improve police-community relations but frequently have little impact on specific crime and disorder problems.

Community Involvement in Problem-Solving Efforts

Engaging the community without problem solving provides no meaningful service to the public. Problem solving without [partnerships] risks overlooking the most pressing community concerns. Thus the partnership between police departments and the communities they serve is essential for implementing a successful program in community policing.¹

Community leaders, researchers and police officials recognize the need for a strong, well-articulated role for community members in community policing efforts. They know that the police alone cannot substantially impact crime and advocate for the community as a full partner in preventing and responding to problems. Community involvement is an integral part of any long-term problem-solving strategy. At the most basic level, the community provides policing agencies with invaluable information on both the problems of concern to them and the nature of those problems. Community involvement also helps ensure that policing agencies concentrate on the appropriate issues in a manner that will create support. In addition, collaborative work involving police and community members provides the community with insight into the police perspective on specific crime and disorder problems.

Traditionally, community involvement in crime prevention and reduction efforts has been limited to serving as the "eyes and ears" for police or in helping implement responses. Under this grant program, the COPS Office envisions much greater and more substantive roles for community members. For example, students in a high school with a drug-use problem on school grounds might survey their peers to determine the extent of the problem and also help design responses to the problem. The COPS Office encourages applications on a diverse range of problems experienced in and around

schools across the country. Although drug- and gang-related problems receive a great deal of media attention and are significant concerns for many schools and other communities, other less high-profile problems frequently concern students. These problems include robbery, larceny, bullying, sexual assault, dating violence, loitering and disorderly conduct, and fear of certain locations such as bathrooms, cafeterias, playgrounds, and paths or routes students take to get to and from school. Applications focusing on these and other similar problems are encouraged.

For additional information on the collaborative problem-solving process as it relates to this grant program, see the enclosed companion document, "Problem-Solving Tips."

Examples of Problem-Solving Efforts Involving Schools

Charlotte, North Carolina

As part of a research project, two demographically similar high schools in the Charlotte, NC, school system agreed to participate in an experiment involving the use of problem solving to reduce crime and disorder. One school served as the experimental site and the other served as the control site.

At the experimental site, a problem-solving curriculum was incorporated into 11th grade government and history classes. Some 250 students in 13 classes were trained in the principles of problem solving and participated in various problem-solving efforts. The initiative began with the students in each class selecting several school-related problems that concerned them. Typical problems included quality of life or disorder issues, such as problems associated with the school parking lots (loitering, traffic congestion and accidents), the cafeteria (hostility, fear and assaults), and the rest rooms

(fear, cleanliness and smoking). Each class then voted on the various problems they identified and selected one on which to concentrate their efforts.

An example of problem solving at the school is illustrated by an attempt to understand students' fear resulting from incidents in the school cafeteria. In this instance, a relatively simple problem was analyzed, and students and school employees worked together to implement tailored responses. A close examination of the factors contributing to assaults in the cafeteria and resulting in students' fear, identified several sources of the problem. Because most of the students ate at the same time, the cafeteria was overcrowded, and the most popular foods were often in short supply. As a result, the bigger students tended to cut in line to get the popular food, causing hostilities and creating a tense atmosphere that led to fights.

Responses to the cafeteria problem, which were developed by the students, included the proposal that more food service stations be opened and that larger quantities of the popular food be made available. The students worked with cafeteria personnel to develop consensus in favor of the changes. Once the changes were made, the atmosphere in the cafeteria improved.

Other problems identified by students were addressed in a similar fashion. Teachers typically oversaw the analysis of the problems and helped evaluate the effectiveness of the potential solutions. A school resource officer at the experimental school also participated in the process by attending problem-solving classes and providing assistance when needed. In comparison, at the control high school, students were not taught problem-solving skills and were not required to tackle specific crime or disorder problems. Furthermore, the school resource officer assigned to the control school did not alter his regular duties

during the course of the project.

After the project had been in place for one school year, the number of students at the experimental school reporting that they were "almost always afraid someone would hurt or bother them" decreased by more than 50 percent, while the number of students reporting almost always being afraid at the control school increased 40 percent.

Furthermore, at the experimental school the number of students who said they were almost never afraid increased by 35 percent. The percentage of students who reported they were almost never afraid remained unchanged at the control school. The experimental school also experienced 29 percent fewer incidents meriting suspension and 70 percent fewer conflicts between students than in previous years.

A full journal article on the Charlotte effort, titled "Reducing Fear in the Schools: Managing Conflict Through Student Problem Solving," by Dennis Kenney and Steuart Watson, can be found in *Education and Urban Society*, Vol. 28, No. 4, August 1996, 436-455: Sage Publications.

St. Petersburg, Florida

During the 1994-95 school year, parents of students at Baypoint Middle School had become increasingly concerned about what they perceived to be gangs in the school and violence perpetrated by high school students against their children, particularly on the walk home from school. To learn more about the problem, a community policing officer consulted with the school resource officer who believed that no formal gang problems existed at the school. His perception was confirmed by the supervisor of the Gang Intelligence Team who indicated that he did not know of gang problems at the school.

The community policing officer decided

to look into the problem further. He reviewed calls for service from Baypoint Middle School and the other six middle schools in St. Petersburg and found that Baypoint Middle School had more than twice the number of calls for service than any of the other schools during the first half of the 1994-95 school year.

Specifically, Baypoint had reported 101 calls for service, the most frequent of which were hang-ups on the 911 system (32), simple assaults (15), larceny (10) and reports of disorderly conduct by juveniles (8). Although the school clearly was experiencing some problems, it did not appear to be as violent as the parents believed.

To understand the perspective of the parents and other interested parties, the community policing officer convened a meeting with the school principal, the chief of police, staff of the police department's Youth Resources Section and Community Policing, and over 60 parents. The parents reiterated their concerns that older students were victimizing their children by coming on school grounds in the afternoon and also voiced their concerns regarding crowding at the school.

To collect more information about problem spots on school grounds, the police department's crime analysis unit and the city planning department conducted an environmental survey. The survey found that the public telephone on campus had been placed in an area that was somewhat secluded, possibly accounting for the high number of 911 hang-ups. The survey also identified a poorly designed fenced bicycle area that probably contributed to the level of bike thefts.

A variety of responses were implemented to address the problems at the middle school. The problematic public telephone was temporarily locked and then relocated to a place with better natural surveillance. School officials closed the fenced bicycle area and designated an indoor

area for storage of bikes. For several weeks at the beginning of the response phase, several officers patrolled the school, particularly during dismissal time. The department made it clear to the community that the extra patrols were a short-term response and that they believed an effective long-term response would include the environmental changes; increased parental involvement; and continued communication among the parents, police and the school. As a result, several parents began monitoring problem locations on the school grounds and helped supervise the daily dismissal process to inhibit problem behaviors. Furthermore, a school staff member with a portable video camera began roaming the campus during dismissal to discourage high school students from coming on campus and to reduce problem behaviors by the middle school students. Finally, extended discussions with parents about the true nature of the problems at Baypoint Middle School, which were less serious than they had originally thought, helped to reduce the associated fear of violence.

An initial assessment of the implemented responses indicated that the number of 911 hang-ups was reduced from 32 (between September 1994 and mid-February 1995) to zero (from mid-February 1995 to May 1995). Further, while Baypoint Middle School had accounted for 30 percent of all calls for service from middle schools during the first half of the school year, after the responses were implemented, it accounted for just 21 percent of calls in the second half of the year.

A full newsletter article on the St. Petersburg effort, titled "Was the Violence at Baypoint Middle School Perceived or Fact?" by Major William Proffitt, can be found in Community Policing Problem Solving, Vol. 2, No. 3, August 1995: St. Petersburg Police Department.

SCHOOL-BASED PARTNERSHIPS

Application Forms

[REDACTED]

Project Application

Background Information

(CFDA #16.710)

Please answer all of the following questions completely. Please type all answers.

Policing Agency Information

If primary applicant is a consortium, list lead agency below and attach a listing of all consortium members.

LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY'S LEGAL NAME

9-DIGIT EIN NUMBER

Applicant agency's nine-digit EIN. If your agency has been assigned an EIN by the Office of Justice Programs, please use that number. Otherwise, your Internal Revenue Service EIN should be used.

LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY ORI NUMBER (Assigned by FBI for UCR reporting)

NAME OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY'S CHIEF EXECUTIVE

TITLE

AGENCY ADDRESS

CITY

STATE

ZIP CODE

TELEPHONE

FAX

NAME OF CONTACT PERSON FOR GRANT / GRANT PROJECT COORDINATOR

TITLE

TELEPHONE

FAX

E-MAIL ADDRESS

Government Information

GOVERNMENT EXECUTIVE'S NAME

TITLE

NAME OF GOVERNMENT ENTITY

ADDRESS

CITY

STATE

ZIP CODE

TELEPHONE

FAX

Partner (Secondary Applicant)

PRIMARY CONTACT PERSON/SCHOOL EXECUTIVE NAME

TITLE

NAME OF GROUP/SCHOOL DISTRICT

ADDRESS

CITY

STATE

ZIP CODE

TELEPHONE

FAX

E-MAIL ADDRESS

Focus School Information

NAME OF FOCUS SCHOOL IN THE SCHOOL-BASED PARTNERSHIP PROJECT

NAME OF SCHOOL PRINCIPAL

ADDRESS

CITY

STATE

TELEPHONE

FAX

E-MAIL ADDRESS

DOES THE POLICING AGENCY (*primary applicant*) HAVE PRIMARY GEOGRAPHIC JURISDICTION OVER THE SCHOOL AND SURROUNDING AREAS?☐ YES☐ NO

IF "NO," PLEASE EXPLAIN:

PLEASE CHECK THE FOCUS SCHOOL TYPE BELOW

☐ HIGH SCHOOL☐ MIDDLE SCHOOL/JUNIOR HIGH☐ ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

PLEASE LIST GRADES SERVED BY THE SCHOOL (e.g., K through 6)

____ THROUGH ____

THIS SCHOOL IS:

☐ PUBLIC☐ PRIVATE

SMALLEST AREA SERVED BY SCHOOL

☐ NEIGHBORHOOD☐ CITY☐ COUNTY☐ OTHER: _____

(NAME OF AREA): _____

Collaboration Agreement

To be eligible for funding, a law enforcement agency must apply in partnership with either a specific school, school district or a nonprofit, community-based entity. A partnership between a policing agency and a school is encouraged, but if such a partnership is not practical, a policing agency may partner with a nonprofit community group. Appropriate school-based partners could include the school administration, PTA, etc. Appropriate community-based entities could include social service providers, civic and municipal agencies, neighborhood associations, community coalitions, nonprofit health organizations, or faith groups. Student representatives also must be incorporated into the project in addition to the school or nonprofit community-based group. Appropriate student representatives could include student government members, members of a student club or organization, or students who will serve on a working group developed specifically for this grant project. A Collaboration Agreement must be signed by the policing agency, the partner and a student representative. For assistance in developing a Collaborative Agreement see p. 53 of the application instructions.

Primary Applicant's Name: _____
 ORI #: _____ Status: _____

Student Participants (Student government, student club, student advisory group or representative group of students organized specifically for project, etc.)

NAME OF GROUP		PRIMARY CONTACT PERSON FOR STUDENTS	
ADDRESS			
CITY		STATE	ZIP CODE
TELEPHONE	E-MAIL ADDRESS	FAX	

General information

HAS THE LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY (Primary Applicant) RECEIVED OTHER COPS GRANTS?

☐ YES ☐ NO

IF "YES," UNDER WHICH PROGRAM(S) HAS THE LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY RECEIVED FEDERAL FUNDS? (Choose all that apply.)

- ☐ COPS: PHASE I ☐ COPS AHEAD ☐ COPS FAST ☐ COPS MORE
☐ UNIVERSAL HIRING PROGRAM ☐ COMMUNITY POLICING TO COMBAT DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
☐ TROOPS TO COPS ☐ POLICE CORPS ☐ ADVANCING COMMUNITY POLICING
☐ PROBLEM-SOLVING PARTNERSHIPS ☐ ANTI-GANG INITIATIVE/YOUTH FIREARMS VIOLENCE INITIATIVE
☐ REGIONAL COMMUNITY POLICING INSTITUTE

TYPE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY

- ☐ MUNICIPAL ☐ COUNTY PD ☐ SHERIFF ☐ INDIAN TRIBAL
☐ TRANSIT ☐ SCHOOL DISTRICT ☐ PUBLIC HOUSING ☐ CONSORTIUM
☐ OTHER (Please specify) _____

HAS YOUR ORGANIZATION SUBMITTED A COLLABORATION AGREEMENT SIGNED BY THE LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY, PARTNER APPLICANT(S) AND A STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE?
 (See p. 53 for more details.)

☐ COMPLETED COLLABORATION AGREEMENT

CURRENT POPULATION SERVED BY LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY

SQUARE MILES COVERED (Exclude the population and square miles primarily served by other law enforcement agencies within your jurisdiction. For example, sheriff's departments must exclude populations and areas covered by a city police department for which the sheriff's department has no primary law enforcement authority.)

GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION OF THE PRIMARY APPLICANT (Please indicate municipality, county or parish, and state or territory.)

FEDERAL CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT(S) (Number)

TOTAL NUMBER OF 1997 PART I INDEX CRIMES (See glossary of terms on p 7 of the application for complete list of Part I crimes.)

LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY'S FISCAL YEAR

FROM: ____/____/____ TO: ____/____/____

LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY'S COGNIZANT FEDERAL AGENCY (See page 6 for definition)

IS YOUR AGENCY DELINQUENT ON ANY FEDERAL DEBTS?

☐

YES

☐

NO

IF "YES," PLEASE EXPLAIN

CURRENT AUTHORIZED SWORN FORCE STRENGTH (Indicate if your department does not have an authorized strength.)

ACTUAL SWORN FORCE STRENGTH AS OF 1/1/98 (Include funded vacancies.)

TOTAL AMOUNT OF FEDERAL FUNDS REQUESTED UNDER THIS PROPOSAL

(Note: There is no cap on the amount of funds you can request. However, resource requests must be linked to problem solving and should be commensurate with the scope of the proposed project. Average award amounts are anticipated to be between \$100,000 and \$150,000.)

Signatures

I certify that the information provided on this form is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge. I understand that as a condition of funding, the applicants must comply with all application and program requirements of the Public Safety Partnership and Community Policing Act of 1994 and other requirements of Federal law.

LAW ENFORCEMENT EXECUTIVE'S SIGNATURE (Original signature of person named on the front of this form)

DATE

GOVERNMENT EXECUTIVE'S SIGNATURE (Original signature of person named on the front of this form)

DATE

PARTNER'S SIGNATURE

DATE

STUDENT'S SIGNATURE

DATE

Intergovernmental Review Process

DATE SUBMITTED TO STATE SINGLE POINT OF CONTACT (If your state participates in the Executive Order 12872 Intergovernmental Review Process (see the Appendix), please fill in the date on which you made a copy of this application available to the Single Point of Contact for review.)

CFBA NUMBER

16,710

Primary Applicant's Name: _____
ORI #: _____ State: _____

Problem Selection

Make your selection from the problems listed below and mark the appropriate box. For the purposes of this application, please select only one problem. For example, you could focus on a vandalism problem, or you could focus on an assault problem, but not both. You will not be precluded from working on other related problems in the school or adjacent areas, but please provide information in your description that focuses on one primary problem experienced in or around schools.

The list below encompasses a wide range of problems related to schools and adjacent areas. For example, a school crime problem of thefts from lockers may be captured under "Larceny" and a problem of fights between students may be captured under "Assault." Although broad or more general problems, such as youth gangs or gang violence, should not be selected, a specific problem perpetrated by a youth gang, such as assaults or disputes, may be selected. Large-scale events — such as sporting events, homecoming and graduation parties — which result in crime and disorder problems may be captured by any of several categories below depending on the nature of the problem. See "Problem-Solving Tips" for more information on identifying and selecting a problem.

If time permits, we strongly encourage applicants to hold focus groups with students, parents and nearby residents to get their perspectives on the crime and disorder problems in and around the focus school.

Choose only ONE problem from the following categories:

Property Crimes

- ☐ LARCENY (OTHER THAN AUTOMOBILE-RELATED THEFT)
- ☐ THEFT FROM AUTO ON SCHOOL PROPERTY
- ☐ OTHER PROPERTY CRIME: _____

Violent Crimes

- | | |
|---|--|
| ☐ ASSAULT (NONSEXUAL) NOT INVOLVING WEAPON(S) | ☐ ASSAULT (NONSEXUAL) INVOLVING WEAPON(S) |
| ☐ BULLYING/THREAT/INTIMIDATION AT SCHOOL | ☐ BULLYING/THREAT/INTIMIDATION OF STUDENTS GOING TO AND FROM SCHOOL |
| ☐ DATING VIOLENCE | ☐ RAPE/SEXUAL ASSAULT |
| ☐ ROBBERY | ☐ OTHER VIOLENT CRIME: _____ |

Problems Associated With Alcohol and Illegal Drugs**ALCOHOL-RELATED PROBLEMS**

- ☐ DWI (DRIVING WHILE INTOXICATED) INVOLVING STUDENTS AT THE FOCUS SCHOOL
- ☐ ALCOHOL CONSUMPTION ON SCHOOL GROUNDS
- ☐ OTHER ALCOHOL-RELATED PROBLEM *(Please describe)* _____

DRUG-RELATED PROBLEMS

- ☐ DRUG DEALING/USE ON SCHOOL GROUNDS
- ☐ OTHER DRUG-RELATED PROBLEM *(Please describe)* _____

Public Order**DISORDER**

- ☐ VANDALISM/GRAFFITI
- ☐ DISORDERLY CONDUCT ON BUSES OR AT TRANSPORTATION POINTS THAT RELATES TO A SPECIFIC CRIME OR STUDENT SAFETY PROBLEM
- ☐ LOITERING ON SCHOOL GROUNDS (FIELDS AND OTHER OUTSIDE LOCATIONS) THAT RELATES TO A SPECIFIC CRIME OR STUDENT SAFETY PROBLEM
- ☐ DISORDERLY CONDUCT IN CLASSROOMS/HALLWAYS/CAFETERIA/STAIRWELLS/RESTROOMS THAT RELATES TO A SPECIFIC CRIME OR STUDENT SAFETY PROBLEM
- ☐ OTHER DISORDER THAT RELATES TO A SPECIFIC CRIME OR STUDENT SAFETY PROBLEM *(Please describe)* _____

DISPUTES

- ☐ BETWEEN STUDENTS, STUDENTS AND TEACHERS (OR OTHER PERSONNEL), MEMBERS OF DIFFERENT CULTURAL GROUPS OR OTHER GROUP AFFILIATIONS, ETC. THAT POSE A SPECIFIC THREAT TO STUDENT SAFETY *(Please describe the involved parties)* _____

Primary Applicant's Name: _____
ORI #: _____ State: _____

- d. How do you know the problem is a priority for the school community (including students, teachers, school administration, parents, community-based entities, etc.) as compared to other problems in or around the focus school?

- e. What responses, if any, have already been tried, and what has been the impact of these responses? *(Please include any available statistics.)*

RESPONSE #1: _____

HOW LONG WAS IT IN PLACE? FROM: ____/____ TO: ____/____ (Month/Year)

IMPACT: _____

RESPONSE #2: _____

HOW LONG WAS IT IN PLACE? FROM: ____/____ TO: ____/____ (Month/Year)

IMPACT: _____

2. Analyzing the Problem

Please provide an overview below of the kind of information you would like to collect about victims, offenders and the crime location that will help you understand the underlying causes of the problem.

Analysis Questions

Now that you have provided an overview of the types of information you would like to collect, what specific questions about the underlying nature of the crime or disorder problem need to be answered before you can develop new and effective, tailor-made responses to the problem? In other words, what questions, if answered, will provide a much more complete picture of the nature, causes and extent of the problem? (For example: *who, what, when, where, how, why, why not, etc.*)

For the problem you have selected, please provide a list of at least five detailed questions about each of the following:

- a. Victims;
- b. The crime environment/location; and
- c. Offenders.

Several of these questions may address the interaction among victims, offenders and the crime environment. For example, a question about a location may include offenders (e.g., "What is attractive about the locations where students or youth loiter?"). These questions do not need to be answered at this time; most applicants will spend the first phase of their problem-solving project collecting data about the problem to answer these questions. See "Problem-Solving Tips" for additional information on analyzing problems and developing a list of questions.

Please feel free to attach additional (or longer) questions on a separate sheet. All attached sheets must be labeled with the primary applicant's legal name, ORI# and state.

A. VICTIMS: Questions relating to victims that need to be answered for your project (*please list*)

Q: _____

Q: _____

Q: _____

Q: _____

Q: _____

Primary Applicant's Name: _____
ORI #: _____ State: _____

B. CRIME ENVIRONMENT (LOCATION): Questions relating to the crime environment that need to be answered for your project *(please list)*

Q: _____

Q: _____

Q: _____

Q: _____

Q: _____

C. OFFENDERS: Questions relating to offenders that need to be answered for your project *(please list)*

Q: _____

Q: _____

Q: _____

Q: _____

Q: _____
