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1. How long has this program operated (month and year)? Note: the program must be between 9 months and 5 years old as of April 5, 2012 to be eligible for this year’s award.

OCJP commenced strategic planning in March of 2010. As of March 31, 2012 the project has been in operation for two years. The first four grants were made in the early Fall of 2010, but have only been considered operational since January 2011 (i.e., the state has only one year of performance data). OCJP continued providing technical assistance throughout 2011 to help local collaboratives refine their evidence-based strategies to ensure their outcomes could be measured, and to ensure the strategies that worked would be replicable. Two additional cities were added late in 2011. OCJP continues in 2012 to monitor all six projects and the data, negotiating corrective action when necessary. An evaluation is planned to end on September 30, 2013.

2. Describe the program:
   - Why was it created?

During the 2010 strategic planning cycle Tennessee’s criminal justice planning agency, the Office of Criminal Justice Programs (OCJP) evaluated the way it was doing business. It was determined that a decade of predictable sub-grants had fostered a sense of “entitlement” among local law enforcement and other sub-grant recipients of state and federal funding. As a result of that mentality, agencies applying for grant funds in TN had become territorial, operating in silos.
Traditional barriers like these failed to produce the intended results: crime was exceeding the normal levels seen across the state and nation. To stimulate new ideas for fighting violent and drug-related crime locally, and to foster the partnerships needed, Tennessee’s Office of Criminal Justice Programs developed a new funding strategy. That strategy uses data to concentrate grant funded resources on local crime reduction, by designing projects that require:

- multi-pronged approaches to crime reduction which employ evidence-based or evidence informed strategies;
- collaboration of community partners and practitioners to inform decisions and implement these approaches; and
- which produce measurable results for replication.

OCJP analyzed crime and demographic data, identifying cities with higher-than-average rates of murder, assault, rape, and other violent crimes. Dwindling resources forced OCJP to target mid-size communities. Evidence of some collaboration in a few of these cities gave them a head start, but local leaders had to form their teams and their strategies before the funding flowed, favoring local investment. OCJP is stimulating local innovations for reducing violent crime by funding creative, data-driven approaches. Six communities are leveraging local resources and joining with police in prevention, enforcement and offender intervention initiatives, and circulating data on results to encourage sustained investment and replication by other cities.

Why is it a new and creative approach or method?

Violent and drug-related crime, theft, gangs, blight, mistrust of the police, and indifference to the conditions fostering crime are universal public safety issues. “Collaboration” and “technical assistance” are not new to the criminal justice planning process. Program management that is “data-driven,” using “performance measures,” that is “replicable” and “evidence-based” is only relatively new to public safety. The innovation here lies not in how these approaches have been discussed in the past, but in how they are being implemented in their totality through this targeted crime reduction program. What’s unique and innovative about Tennessee’s approach? Seven elements:

- **Collaboration:** Traditionally, collaboration means “who will this project affect?” or “who have you spoken to about this project?” Instead, the Tennessee the Targeted Community Crime Reduction Program (TCCRP) cities are required to gather a coalition of practitioners and community members to discuss the crime data, identify the approaches to combating crime, form formal alliances, and meet regularly to ensure proper implementation and data on the results. In this approach, community organizations, residents, treatment providers, other practitioners and the courts all share the burden with police departments. Typically a grant writer would be the only person with a full grasp of the nuances of the grant application. But with TCCRP all collaborators know each piece of the local project regardless of its effect on their agencies. Many of the collaborators are there from the initial discussions about the crime problem through implementation, to the reporting of project outcomes.

- **Technical Assistance:** As it relates to the state’s assistance to communities, “TA” usually means grant writing workshops or one-day training sessions on the subjects of strategic planning, building partnerships, or creating performance measures. These are often done sporadically, and involve a wide variety of prospective grantees. But in Tennessee, the TCCRP program has dedicated hundreds of hours of staff time specifically with the targeted communities to help them develop their strategic plans and grant applications. It has been a coordinated and comprehensive effort, focused on only the targeted grantees, and intended to ensure the success of each aspect of the project – from the collection of crime planning data through project design and implementation, and ending with the identification of results.

- **Data-Driven:** Typically “data driven” means that a grant applicant justifies its request by citing demographic statistics describing its population, unemployment rates, median income
and crime rates in that particular jurisdiction only. In Tennessee the TCCRP process first identifies those communities suffering the highest crime rates in the state to locate candidates. Those communities analyze and present their crime demographics, including geo-maps of potential target areas within their city by types of crime before selecting target zones. Finally, these data serve as baselines for ensuring the project is progressing according to plan, guiding improvements in project implementation and offering comparisons for trends in future measurement of crime patterns.

- **Evidence-Based Strategies (EBS):** This is a term relatively new to public safety, even if it has been used in public health for some time. The concept has various meanings, but TCCRP uses it to refer to the degree of documented outcome evaluation support a model has produced. TCCRP leaves some room for interpretation about the varying degrees of rigor in outcome evaluation. OCJP made it clear at the outset that the preferred strategies for funding would be those supported by published studies of evaluation research. However, we soon discovered during our searches for models that there are few rigorous evaluations in the public safety field – especially of pre-enforcement prevention and enforcement approaches. Moreover, even the best examples of EBS suffer losses in credibility when a city attempting to implement a project with fidelity finds it cannot maintain the approach in a “real world” milieu. As a result Tennessee’s program adopted a slightly more flexible approach, permitting a city to adopt an evidence-based approach and modify it in order to replicate it in that city’s unique environment – or to adopt an “evidence-informed” approach (i.e., one with documented outcome measurements that might not have been validated using evaluation research). The key was that ANY approach had to be accompanied by state-of-the-art outcome measures and data collection mechanisms. Even that proved to be a challenging position to take, because not even larger cities have a great deal of experience with quality outcome measurement. To counter this challenge, Tennessee’s TCCR program employed a program evaluation advisor with several years of nationally recognized experience to advise on the outcome designs of the projects. OCJP also insisted that the projects build in resources to engage local evaluators to ensure fidelity to the program and to track its progress. Most of these evaluators, who were found among the state’s many colleges and universities, were present at the initial strategic design sessions so they could help integrate measurement into the designs. These evaluators are coordinated by the state’s evaluation advisor, which convenes periodic problem-solving and TA sessions for the evaluators. The local evaluators’ first-year problem analysis responsibilities included documenting project roll-outs and implementation to ensure each project’s fidelity to the program. Now, they are working with the cities’ project directors to ensure thorough collection and reporting of performance data.

- **Multi-pronged Approach:** There have been very few programs nationally, and none that have come through this office in 15 years, that take a multi-pronged approach to a crime problem. Tennessee’s TCCRP requires the community to identify a variety of evidence-based programs to be employed to reduce the type of crime identified in the target area(s). A balance among three strategies is required: prevention, enforcement and offender intervention. The community collaborators must agree on the types of strategies that will work in concert to have the desired result. Example: If gang-related crime is the problem in the targeted area, at least one strategy geared toward preventing gang affiliation must be employed, along with a gang enforcement strategy and an offender intervention strategy focused on keeping gang members or potential gang members from being re-arrested in those targeted areas.

- **Sustainable and Replicable:** Grant applicants always indicate their grant will be sustainable once grant funds run out. They also usually make claims about the ease of replication. In practice neither happens very often. But one of the main tenets of this program is the community’s involvement. Community “ownership” helps to ensure sustainability by encouraging citizen investment in the success of the approach. Showing the community that a
simple reallocation of resources, and getting individuals to commit to the idea of cleaning up these neighborhoods have demonstrated elsewhere that programs can be sustained. As TCCRP worked through the trials of strategic planning we were told time and time again that “even if no grant comes to us, we will have learned how to come together as a collaborative; we will know how to plan strategically.” Project reports are documenting that even without a state requirement all the TCCRP communities have invested additional resources (e.g., manpower, equipment, property and office space) into the projects. Some have used the momentum of the TCCRP initiative as an incentive for leveraging city budgets to obtain housing and urban development grants and partnerships with other non-profits, such as Habitat for Humanity. They are implementing even broader-reaching reclamation projects – which is further evidence of the sustainability of this approach. OCJP and the affected communities have been working diligently to identify the processes necessary for replication, and have been working together to mentor other cities as they discover the advantages of these types of projects. When our target cities sustain the compelling parts of their projects after the funding expires, that will convince other cities to adopt these strategies, too. For that to work, comprehensive outcome measurement must be convincing about what is effective in real-world situations, so that other cities will recognize how to do business differently.

Significance for other cities in Tennessee and other states: The project offers a number of lessons that figure to benefit other jurisdictions. The projects’ mayors and police chiefs have:

- Focused funds on narrow targets of opportunity: They are making better use of demographic and socio-economic data and geo-coding software to produce the greatest “return” on their crime reduction efforts.
- Tailored strategies to fit their communities: Collaborators (prevention, treatment and judicial practitioners) have placed safety above their desire for temporary grant money, benefitting the entire community.
- Worked out practical solutions: When confidentiality was blocking referrals from the juvenile court to diversion, Probation figured out a way to share the needed information, and re-arrests of participants are expected to decline.
- Measured results: Establishing baselines for neighborhood crime, resident perceptions of safety, and the behaviors of offenders made change management possible. University evaluators are surveying residents about changes and tracking crime indicators.

High risk, mid-size cities are serving as demonstration sites, showing other cities how small investments in new methods can maximize the impact on crime.

- Concentrated funding is a good way to show what adequate resources can do to reduce violent crime in small areas experiencing much of the violent crime.
- Local leaders need structure, flexibility, tools and support to design their own approaches. The state must facilitate local planning.
- The longest-lasting changes come from redirecting local resources to the existing infrastructure (e.g., re-focusing police manpower and other city resources will outlast programs funded by short-term grants).
- Over the long term state grants can “seed” cycles of innovation to address what’s important statewide.

What are the specific activities and operations of the program in chronological order?

OCJP has undertaken a strategic approach that is both long-term and driven by significant attempts to innovate. Strategic program management has been an essential value of OCJP, going back to its first major planning overhaul in 1998-99. The approach OCJP took for the TCCR project might be viewed as the culmination of that philosophy – one that will expand if it proves successful in demonstrating the power of outcome-oriented program planning. OCJP’s approach is taking place in four phases:
• Phase One: Planning and Development (March 2010 – June 2010): With assistance from an experienced planner/evaluator (Performance Vistas, Inc.) OCJP leaders developed a relatively sophisticated application for discretionary Justice Department innovation resources. As part of the strategic planning process, Tennessee conducted the research into violent crime trends, offender and victim populations and histories of local collaboration. OCJP identified a number of candidate cities, and ranked them by critical variables (e.g., violent and drug-related crime rates; strength of prior collaborative efforts). It extended invitations to four cities to apply for one of the special, non-competitive three-year sub-grants. It conducted a round of site visits to meet with local leaders, encouraging them and offering TA. In the fiscal climate of early 2010, the cities were not intimidated by the demands of such a rigorous approach, as the projects’ budgets represented significant infusions of resources for cities of 30,000 to 80,000 citizens. Nevertheless, local leaders were understandably cautious about a limited-time project. The mayors and chiefs overcome their initial hesitation once they could see the promise of trying out tested innovations and adopting those changes that could be sustained without further grant money.

• Phase Two: Training, Technical Assistance, Project Design and Refinement (July 2010 – December 2011): OCJP and the lead evaluator developed a highly rigorous 20-page sub-grant application framed in strategic program design concepts. Applicants had to develop a well-reasoned and evidence-based design, complete with adequate success measures, as a prerequisite for the funding. We conducted a series of several daylong training sessions on logical, performance-focused program designs. (The cities’ veteran grant-writers told us that they had never experienced such a challenging project design/application process.) One indication that this was definitely NOT “business-as-usual” (i.e., not a traditional grant application process) was the state’s requirement that the cities design their approaches before the funding began. OCJP also insisted that the cities budget for a local academic partner to help with process and outcome evaluation, performance measurement, and project start-up planning. (These evaluators are being coordinated by the state’s evaluation lead, who was involved in the project’s design from the beginning.) State staff facilitated coalition-building in the communities, and helped local partners develop the necessary support networks – not an easy task where community-based agencies for prevention or after-care/re-entry of offenders have seldom been welcomed as partners by law enforcement. The cities did their own research into crime patterns and target populations, and examined evidence-based strategies. They selected EBS models that “fit” their local problems and resources. For example, one city has had a growing youth gang problem, and it focused on that – where most of the cities remained open to all forms of drug-related and violent crime (adult and youthful offenders alike). The applicant cities spent the next several months submitting draft project designs, receiving detailed and constructive criticism, and revising both planned activities and measures of success. Some applications survived four rejected submissions before clarified designs were accepted. The four cities signed their contracts between July 2010 and January 2011.

• Phase Three: Project Implementation and Expansion (July 2010 – September 2013): Four original cities each implemented three strategies. The projects relied on in-house leadership teams to get things started, but they reached out to draw in funded and non-funded partners in their communities. Sub-grant rules required the cities to ensure a balance in the spending on these strategies, to ensure that “business-as-usual” crime reduction (i.e., enforcement-rich actions) would not prevail. An innovative result is that partnerships are forming among agencies that had never worked together on crime reduction before. These are a few of the many strategies being implemented in the original four TCCR P cities:
  • Prevention: Two cities are concentrating their prevention activities on schools within high crime areas of the cities – Cleveland is working with at-risk grade school children and their parents, attempting to reduce school disruptions and suspensions – and referrals to juvenile
court. Murfreesboro is educating grade schoolers about the risks of affiliating with gangs. Kingsport and Jackson are reducing blight and reclaiming high crime neighborhoods by eliminating drug-infested and abandoned properties, mobilizing Neighborhood Watches, cleaning up public areas, installing lighting, educating business owners and residents about preventing crime, and building relationships with residents of the target zones.

• **Enforcement:** All four cities are implementing forms of community-oriented or problem-oriented policing. They are conducting “knock-and-talks” to build public confidence, and investing overtime hours in concentrated responses to crime in the targeted zones. Crime data analysts have been hired where they didn’t exist, to help commanders utilize their manpower most efficiently (SARA: Scanning, Analysis, Response and Assessment). Some equipment has been purchased to help reduce violent crime, such as license plate readers, Segways and bicycles to allow street patrols (Community Policing), computers and cameras. Enforcement leaders are recognizing that arrest counts and state-level incident counts may be masking the patterns of actual crime, so project teams are searching for data sources that reveal real trends in targeted offenses. This is an example of a one-time policy change that costs no money to sustain – and that is truly Smart Policing.

• **Offender Intervention:** Most of the projects implemented an offender treatment component, using providers of therapeutic counseling and drug treatment services to help adults or youth on probation and parole to reduce substance dependencies, build coping skills, and find stable lifestyles (including a place to live and work). The intent is to produce clean drug screens and to reduce re-arrests for drug-related or violent offenses within a period after completing the program. At least two projects have also engaged Goodwill Industries to help participants develop job skills, and find and keep jobs. Murfreesboro is concentrating on juvenile gang affiliates, attempting to reduce drug use relapse rates, reduce referrals to juvenile court for targeted offenses, and build job skills and economic stability. The longer term goal is of course to reduce re-arrests.

Based on the success of the first year in the original four cities, for 2011-2012 OCJP extended the invitation to two more mid-sized cities, and repeated the development process there. OCJP applied lessons learned from the initial four cities to cities 5 (Clarksville) and 6 (Columbia). They too, worked through some challenging issues to bring their collaboratives together, adopting strategies that were working elsewhere, and adjusting them to fit their own communities. Projects 5 and 6 signed their contracts in October 2011 and February 2012, and began delivering services under the TCCRP grant. The cities drew elements of their enforcement and offender intervention strategies from each of the original four sites, but also innovated in prevention themselves. For example Columbia is not only using Big Brothers and Big Sisters in concert with the city parks department to conduct after school mentoring programs. It is also sponsoring a baseball league during the summer, to build relationships with at-risk grade schoolers while school is out. Rolling out two new cities this year has demonstrated how to promote the approach, and how to encourage replication. An important consideration is that no single strategy, or even a single city’s one- or two-part strategy, would be considered uniquely innovative: community policing has been linked with school-based prevention or with offender rehabilitation elsewhere. But the TCCRP innovation is the coordinated and balanced demonstration of how all three of these locally designed strategies can work together to encourage an outcome-oriented approach to state criminal justice planning.

• **Phase Four: Project Evaluation, Sustainability Planning, “Marketing” for Replication (October 2011 – September 2013):** OCJP is making site visits to observe and monitor the implementation of the projects. Twice each year the state sponsors “All Hands on Deck” sessions for technical assistance in solving collaboration and implementation issues, as well as to deal with data collection and reporting challenges. The lead evaluator is convening dialogue
sessions with the local evaluation partners to encourage technology sharing and to solve data collection and analysis problems. For example, we have dealt with the human subject research implications of pre- and post-testing school children to obtain their perceptions of gang affiliation, and some cities have surveyed business leaders and residents to assess their perceptions of changing neighborhoods. Every six months the projects issue summaries of their implementation challenges and solutions, as well as project output and outcome data. Thus far, these reports have been used to tighten up implementation through technical assistance. But during the second half of 2012 the evaluation will move beyond process analysis to begin analyzing project outcomes. By late 2013 an evaluation report will present the data and draw conclusions about the success of the project for publication and presentation at professional gatherings. Meanwhile, beginning in September 2012, the project directors and evaluators will begin compiling such information as exists to demonstrate what is working for local community leaders. The state team will facilitate training or TA sessions to help the local project teams plan for sustainability discussions with local leaders. (One city’s mayor, another city’s manager and a third’s police chief have all said that the changes being demonstrated to work in their cities will be sustained after the grants end, because infrastructure changes have already shown better ways of operating with city operating budgets.)

- **Is it effective? Provide tangible results and examples.**

  The projects are documenting their outcomes. Overall, they expect to document violent crime on the decline in the targeted neighborhoods. Because effects on crime patterns are expected to take a longer period, OCJP does not expect to have sound outcome data on changes in incident and arrest rates (i.e., indicators of violent and drug-related crime) until later in 2013. Meanwhile, the projects are attempting to obtain data on shorter term outcomes such as these:
  
  o **Prevention:** A gang resistance education program is raising post-test scores among grade schoolers in two at-risk schools.\(^1\) Schools are attempting to reduce the numbers of bullying and assault incidents in these same schools, but are just now able to produce baseline counts of these events.\(^2\) Residents in Jackson are showing greater understanding of housing codes; and they say they’re reclaiming their neighborhoods from blight. Community- and school-oriented policing are increasing trust in police officers.\(^3\) Such changes are expected to reduce juvenile petitions for violence, substance abuse, and blight in the targeted areas of more than one city – although it’s still too soon to show data that are convincing.
  
  o **Enforcement:** Increased arrests and probation violations are associated with reduced violent crime in some “hot spots.” Business leaders in targeted high crime zones say they know how to prevent burglaries and when to report suspicious activity, and residents there are reporting less fear of crime. Such changes should accompany reduced rates of violent crime in the longer

---

1 Murfreesboro reported in February 2012 that post-test scores on standardized tests of its Gang Resistance Education And Training with 65 targeted fourth-graders in one school have increased to 88% from pre-test scores of 76%. In another school, where G.R.E.A.T. targeted 54 students, the post-test average scores were 90% (up from an average of 82% at pre-test). Cleveland is also reporting increases in post-test scoring for 194 students enrolled in its *Positive Action* program.

2 Cleveland reported in February 2012 that the total number of petitions to juvenile court for drugs, alcohol and violence from the targeted high school, middle school and teen learning center had actually exceeded the previous year’s count. It believes the change is explained by attention to the project, and expects the frequency to be reduced as the project continues. Murfreesboro is reporting an increase of incidents resulting in in-school and out-of-school suspensions for the 2010-11 academic year, over the previous year’s figures. The project will demonstrate changes by comparing incident counts in these same schools for 2011-12. Murfreesboro is also trying to document changes in rates of absenteeism and academic progress, but it is still too early to report findings.

3 Jackson has installed a community survey approach administered by the housing code authority. To date the data are anecdotal, but the city expects to be able to report reliable frequencies on what they are now hearing from residents in person.
run, and local law enforcement agencies are re-working their data systems to capture more reliable data to show it.

- **Offender Intervention**: Treatment is expected to reduce the incidence of substance abuse, arrests and probation violations among teens of several of the cities, although these programs will require a good deal more time to operate. Follow-up studies will determine whether these program completers can remain off drugs and out of the courts for up to six months after graduation. Job readiness programs have already begun increasing employment skills for adults, even though the projects do not have enough graduates yet to report outcomes data. Better coping skills are expected to help participants remain drug-free. And, significantly, such changes are expected to reduce the rates of re-arrest among program graduates – something for the evaluation strategy to track for the longer term.

3. **Did this program originate in your state? If YES, please indicate the innovator's name, present address, telephone number, and e-mail address.**

   YES. Bill Scollon, Director, TN OCJP, Office of Criminal Justice Programs, Wm R. Snodgrass Tennessee Tower, 312 Rosa L. Parks Avenue, 12th Floor, Nashville, TN 37243-1102. (615) 532-2983 bill.scollon@tn.gov.

4. **Are you aware of similar programs in other states? If YES, which ones and how does this program differ?**

   There are no other programs known to this office that offer this type of program. We have spoken with administrators from many other states; they say they use the grant methods described above as “traditional” for putting out solicitations and awarding grants. The pattern is to fund individual agencies that are attacking the problem with a unilateral approach. The SMART Policing initiative promoted by the DOJ’s Bureau of Justice Assistance employs some of the techniques used in the TCCRP. However, BJA’s approach is not as far reaching; the “silos mentality” is still a compelling pattern in many, if not all, such projects. Other models and evidence-based approaches exist (some of which we have adopted as parts of the TCCRP strategies). But to our knowledge, no state or federal agency is attempting state-local partnerships designed to demonstrate new methods of planning sustainable interdisciplinary designs at the local level.

5. **What limitations or obstacles might other states expect to encounter when attempting to adopt this program?**

   OCJP encourages technology-sharing and problem-solving, and that approach should be useful for other jurisdictions. For example, OCJP used what it learned in its first four cities to start projects in cities five and six. However, Tennessee learned that merely making time and facilitating opportunities for sharing successes and mentoring other jurisdictions does not necessarily ensure cross-project fertilization. OCJP and the evaluator negotiated a follow-up grant with DOJ/BJA to enhance collaboration among the cities, and to improve sustainability planning. There was a significant budget allocated to travel for mentoring and technology sharing. In the first year of that grant few of the dozens of TCCR project participants took advantage. When we followed up to learn why, we discovered that even after a year of implementation the cities were still working to firm up inter-agency partnerships and data collection in their own cities. They said they did not have time to share their successes with other cities! As a result, during the second half of 2012 the project team will share its results through statewide conferences: The first will be as a plenary presentation at a statewide evidence-based programming conference in May. The second will

---

4 In Jackson, the police department is reporting a significant reduction in the number of “calls for service” related to violent crimes for the fall quarter of 2011 (October-December) over the summer quarter (July-September 2011). Arrest counts were down as well, but the project is still working out the best way to measure crime rate changes that are not confused with the amount of attention being paid to the higher crime zones. Cleveland is reporting an increase in the number of assault, drug and alcohol incidents in its targeted sectors.
come early in 2013, focused strictly on targeted crime reduction. Eventually, we intend to support the formation of an association of targeted crime reduction projects that will grow within Tennessee, and that will sustain itself. OCJP will publish the results of its outcome evaluation late in 2013, along with ideas for more rigorous evaluation research. Hopefully that research will be conducted, after the projects have had time to produce longer term results and reliable data on their impacts. Meanwhile, OCJP is supporting the TCCR project teams, which are educating local leaders about what’s worth sustaining.

Other elements believed to be limitations or obstacles, especially to smaller communities:

- **The State’s Grant-making Process:** The grant administering agency must make drastic changes in the way it looks at the grant-making process. This more strategic approach will require the agency to look beyond its traditional, limited and reactive funding cycles. Deciding to target communities with the greatest need – instead of taking the less controversial course of distributing the resources fairly while under-funding every jurisdiction – requires a change in philosophy. Choosing to dedicate more funds to those communities that show the highest risk will not be acceptable to everyone, especially after decades of grant entitlement expectations. Offering a much greater amount of technical assistance on the “front end,” in exchange for more accountability during implementation at the “back end” (i.e., monitoring and evaluation), takes a fundamental change of grant administration mindsets. On those subjects:
  - **Funding cycle:** The typical state criminal justice grant solicitation is thrown together in 30-45 days, and accepted “as is,” for better or worse. That’s not a huge problem if the grants are smaller and mostly continuations of prior years’ patterns. But this new, longer-range approach requires a fresh examination of the changing problems and needs in all of the state’s communities. Tennessee, for example, learned that some of its mid-sized cities were higher on the violent crime scale than planners had believed. The approach cannot work without more detailed crime trend projections than are typically used in shorter planning cycles. Moreover, changing the approach can disrupt the state’s more traditional funding cycle (which continues to operate in the background), as the targeted projects’ plans and allocation decisions are formulated. Tennessee’s experience was that the designs had to be reworked several times before the applicant was fully prepared for the responsibility, and before the state was ready to issue the grant.
  - **Targeted Funding:** The state administering agency must be ready to change at least some aspects of the way it has made funding decisions historically. Making controversial decisions about which programs and projects deserve the funding will never be seen as “business as usual.” Even decisions that are well reasoned and thoroughly based on reliable data will generate challenges from those not receiving funding. Tennessee saw this happen at both the state level (“why did you choose such small cities when the crime is greatest in the largest cities?”), and the local level (“we were willing to cooperate as long as we thought we were going to get some of the award, but now you’re asking for our help though we’re not receiving any funds”). Political concerns could possibly arise. The location of the grant-making agency itself may factor into its ability to take these innovative steps. Being housed in a fiscal organization might insulate the agency from the kind of political pressure that might be inevitable were it housed in the governor’s office or in a more visible commission setting.
  - **Larger Grants:** Dedicating funds in a single city for multiple collaborative strategies means that the grant will have to be larger than it would be if the police department and the probation office alone were receiving awards. These grants involved as many as ten or twelve funded partners in some cities, and easily that many more unfunded partners. That complexity was what the city planners believed was necessary to make the project succeed. But that complexity also requires greater oversight by the state’s grant program manager,
and greater emphasis on the city’s performance data collection and reporting. On the other hand, a great deal of ongoing implementation monitoring will be happening within the local project team, as partners relying on one another for key elements of the project’s overall activities will hold one another accountable. For example, in one TCCRP city the police department had negotiated a significant role in crime prevention for city housing code inspectors, as part of its blight reduction campaign. (By enforcing building codes, the city wanted to eliminate drug dealer hangouts, making it easier for residents to take back their neighborhoods. Unfortunately, codes inspectors did not complete their tasks in the early stages of the project.) In this case, the state’s program manager had much less to do with controlling the code enforcement unit than did the city’s TCCRP director, who used his connections with the mayor’s office to work out a solution.

- **Technical Assistance:** Local collaboratives often have access to wonderfully adept partners in their own academic communities and in affiliated professions. For example, in the beginning some of the targeted cities in Tennessee used public health experts to help them conduct their crime data analyses; they also drew heavily on professors of social work and statistics as well as criminal justice to work out their project designs. Some had dedicated crime data analysts in the police department to help with focusing their projects. But some communities needed more help than others – their police departments not only were missing data analysts on the payroll, they were unaware of the trend toward using data in their field. Technical assistance in such cases begins from Day One, helping those agencies locate the literature on what has worked in other jurisdictions. (Incidentally, that city used a portion of its grant budget to hire a crime data analyst, whose job in part is to help direct manpower to the “hot spots” located by the previous week’s arrest data.) From the beginning state grant managers assisted throughout months of strategic planning in the communities. The grantees’ need for TA is greatly amplified by this rigorous approach. Grant program managers must plan on spending a good deal more time supporting these projects than their more typical projects, making regular telephone contact, conducting TA sessions, and visiting the sites throughout the life of the grant. States that adopt this approach must be prepared to hire or reassign personnel equipped by their experience to perform this concentrated form of technical assistance.

- **True Collaboration:** It takes a lot of work to break down operational “silos,” to nurture new relationships, and to tackle “turf protection” head on. The fact is, true collaboration, the kind that can actually affect change, is more involved than most people think (though the term “collaboration” has become nearly a cliché). It’s more than cooperation and improved communication. It’s shared purpose. It requires an investment in the immediate success of a partner, even when an agency (or an individual leader) must delay gratification until much later, to see how the whole community benefits. And the stakes are higher with any endeavor involving law enforcement! Criminal justice agencies tend to work in relative isolation, only working with other criminal justice agencies when the justice system requires it. Even more rarely do they work with agencies outside the justice system, such as community-based prevention advocates or correctional re-entry programs. In Tennessee, before OCJP was able to establish trust with the local law enforcement agencies, early drafts of project designs heavily favored law enforcement activities and budgets – relegating prevention and offender intervention strategies to the margins. That was “business as usual” in the Tennessee cities, as it would be in most U. S. cities. (At this point they were still working on their project designs, and had not yet signed a contract with the state.) OCJP stuck to its multi-strategy position, requiring the cities to do the EBS research, knowing they would find precedents that would illustrate the gains made by other cities when partners work together. Then, aware that it might even lose a candidate city, OCJP insisted that the applicant cities balance their budgets to
ensure a legitimate contribution to crime reduction from these other, non-enforcement-oriented strategies. In many cities the police department is the local grant authority, as it offered the structure needed for grant accountability. Therefore, the state’s position meant it was asking the local project collaborative to diminish the role of the very entity (the police) charged with maintaining control over the project. How did the local police departments respond? They willingly gave over parts of their hoped-for budgets to their partners – or they went further, contributing their own non-project staff time and facilities, in order to maintain the level of activity they believed was needed to reduce targeted crime. They led their collaboratives by example. Today, the chiefs and assistant chiefs involved in the TCCR projects are saying they have benefitted from effective new relationships with partners that are making a difference in their communities. But they admit they needed OCJP’s push to begin thinking “outside the box.” The granting agency can identify the agencies needed in these collaborative efforts, but it often works better to set out the expectations and allow the criminal justice agencies to identify their own partners. The state that relinquishes some control over this process allows the local partners to nurture their relationships, building the levels of trust needed if they are all to succeed. What started out as a competition for limited, one-time grant dollars made it clear which agencies were more interested in the money than in the long term benefits of reduced violent crime in the community. In the end, those motivated by the best interests of the community became key collaborators, whether or not they received any project funding.

- **Flexibility in Redesign:** OCJP began the project with a high regard for evidence-based program models. The state required the applicants to search the literature for approaches to prevention, enforcement and offender intervention that were supported by outcomes data indicating a likelihood of success. The project team learned quickly that attempting to replicate with fidelity an approach found in the literature was going to be extremely difficult in mid-sized Tennessee cities with fewer community resources than are available in their urban counterparts. OCJP also realized that a key to success was having the city collaboratives adopt a design as their own – one that targeted the age brackets of their at-risk populations, the crime patterns they were seeing in their own neighborhoods, and the service alternatives available to them in their service agency networks. The cities found it difficult to locate the exact EBS models for all three of their strategy requirements, so OCJP permitted some flexibility. If a city discussed and dismissed known EBS models for good reasons, OCJP permitted the city to adjust the models to fit their situation – as long as there were adequate measures of outcome and data collection built into the design. As a result, we have some cities implementing model enforcement programs with fidelity alongside prevention programs that should be considered “evidence-informed” strategies. There may be no published outcome data on these modified approaches, but there will be *after* the project ends, because of the project’s attention to measurement up front. We cite this example to say that there will inevitably be starts and stops in the strategic planning process at both the state and local levels. A city may identify what looks like a good evidence-based strategy, only to find in the throes of implementing it that it doesn’t work well with the other strategies. Or that it fails to fit the community’s character. Collaborators directly involved in the implementation of the strategy may not support it (e.g., a great approach for juvenile diversion was nixed because the judge refused to share the information needed for making referrals to partner agencies). The community may not support it. Expect this: a candidate city will examine many strategies, and may even try some out, before the final strategies are settled on. In Tennessee we learned that this trial period lasted in some cases for months. Offender intervention strategies (those intended to reduce crime by reducing re-arrests among known offenders) may have the best library of literature on what works, but they take the longest to work out case referrals and short-term measures of results. The positive aspect of this model-selection exercise is the identification of what works and
what doesn’t in the community. It also helps key players locate the strengths and weaknesses of the community’s partners.

- **Evaluative Experience:** Few communities have much experience developing sound logic models or conducting the search for evidence-based strategies. Still fewer can develop good performance measures, let alone effective outcome evaluations. Counting project outputs or process objectives and tracking compliance with grant requirements is the current “state of the art,” and it is done rather well in our experience. But states are usually going to be met with skepticism or confusion when potential sub-grantees are told they must also produce outcomes data. Some who see the strength of longer-term outcomes, such as crime rate reductions, find it overwhelmingly complicated to measure short-term changes in behaviors, skills and attitudes (e.g., rate of clear drug screens; public perceptions of increased safety in the “hot spot” neighborhoods). The need for short-term outcomes is especially critical because longer range outcomes, such as reductions in assault arrests, will not happen overnight. Even seasoned college professors who are comfortable with research and statistical analysis will sometimes express doubt they can function effectively as process evaluators or outcome measurers. Tennessee’s experience was that academics delve readily into experimental and quasi-experimental designs, but find it difficult to coordinate process evaluations and performance measurement approaches in the field. But process analysis and outcome measurement are crucial prerequisites for “gold standard” evaluation research. On at least one occasion one of our TCCR projects ran aground during the logic model design phase because the selected academic could not adapt to the less rigorous but essential process analysis. The professor tried valiantly to steer the design team toward offender interventions that set up comparisons of treatment and control groups – all of which were defeated by their inability to find support in that community. Our local evaluation partners have become excellent coaches for project directors who have little measurement or data collection experience. But even they are challenged by the demands of working with the leads of ten or fifteen prevention, enforcement and intervention strategies simultaneously. There is also tension among the roles of project director, the three strategy leads, and the local evaluators. It is clearly the task of the evaluator to advise the director on how to identify short-term and long-term performance measures, and perhaps to train the strategy leads on how to use data collection instruments. But it is the director’s role to ensure the partners are collecting and reporting data to the evaluator. That is complicated by the number of components, individuals and agencies involved in each city – and most of these project directors in fact have full-time positions with responsibilities beyond leading the grant project. Further, performance evaluation of multiple strategies requires more measurement effort than will be found in a typical state-funded project. The TCCRP requires dedicated evaluators that meet regularly with OCJP staff to discuss successes, problems and solutions.

**Tennessee’s Targeted Community Crime Reduction Program** is a two-year-old state-local innovation partnership. TN OCJP is trying out data-driven planning with evidence-based project designs. It’s making heavy investments in TA and outcome measurement in order to implement three-part strategies for reducing violent crime in six mid-sized communities that are willing to collaborate in ways going beyond “business-as-usual.” The program’s promise may be fulfilled in 2013-14, when data on project results are published, when the target cities sustain their strategies after the funding ends, and when other Tennessee cities find sufficient reason to replicate the approaches that have been demonstrated to be successful.

---

5 The project directors in Jackson and Columbia are the assistant chiefs of police. In Clarksville the director is a lieutenant with CPD. In Murfreesboro, the director is a manager from the Housing Authority. In Cleveland it is the City Manager. Kingsport is currently searching for its third project director, all of whom have worked for the city housing authority in close coordination with the mayor’s office. Kingsport’s project director is the only one whose position was generated by the grant.
Use these as guidelines to determine the appropriate Program Category for your state’s submission and list that program category on page one of this application. Choose only one.

**Infrastructure and Economic Development**
- Business/Commerce
- Economic Development
- Transportation

**Government Operations and Technology**
- Administration
- Elections
- Information Systems
- Public Information
- Revenue
- Telecommunications

**Health & Human Services**
- Aging
- Children & Families
- Health Services
- Housing
- Human Services

**Human Resources/Education**
- Education
- Labor
- Management
- Personnel
- Training and Development
- Workforce Development

**Natural Resources**
- Agriculture
- Energy
- Environment
- Environmental Protection
- Natural Resources
- Parks & Recreation
- Water Resources

**Public Safety/Corrections**
- Corrections
- Courts
- Criminal Justice
- Drugs
- Emergency Management
- Public Safety

Save in .doc or rtf. Return completed application AND video (if applicable) electronically to innovations@csg.org or mail to:

CSG Innovations Awards
The Council of State Governments
2760 Research Park Drive
Lexington, KY 40511

**Contact:**
Nancy J. Vickers, National Program Administrator
Phone: 859.244.8105
Fax: 859.244.8001 – Attn: Innovations Awards Program
The Council of State Governments
E-mail: nvickers@csg.org

This application is also available at www.csg.org.