

Grant Monitoring Standards and Guidelines for Hiring and Redeployment

Appendix D: Examples of Redeployment Tracking



Appendix D: Examples of Redeployment Tracking

EXAMPLE 1: REDEPLOYMENT BY SHIFT

The Neely County Sheriff's Department applies for a MORE grant to purchase 10 Mobile Data Terminals (MDTs). The department has 20 full-time officers assigned to patrol; each MDT will be used by more than one officer. Currently, each patrol officer runs an average of 20 tag or license checks per shift. Each check takes about five minutes. If the department receives the MORE grant, it estimates that each officer will only need three minutes per check, a savings of two minutes per check. The cost of the 10 MDTs is \$100,000. To determine its required level of redeployment, the department would use the following formula, which is laid out in the Cost Effectiveness Worksheet portion of the grant application:

Required Redeployment

Line 1	Entry level salary of SWORN police officer (as of Jan. 1, 1998)	1.	\$ 28,000
Line 2	Fringe benefits of SWORN police officer (as of Jan. 1, 1998)	2.	\$ 5,000
Line 3	Add lines 1 and 2	3.	\$ 33,000
Line 4	Multiply line 3 by .75	4.	\$ 24,750
Line 5	Enter figure on line 4 or \$25,000, whichever is less	5.	\$ 24,750
Line 6	Total cost of item, system, or group of like items (100%)	6.	\$100,000
Line 7	Federal amount requested.	7.	\$ 75,000
	Can be no more than 75% of total item cost (line 6)		
Line 8	Divide line 7 by line 5	8.	3.03 FTEs

Projected/Actual Redeployment

The formula used to calculate the projected actual redeployment for this grant would be:

2 min. saved X 20 checks	= 40 min. per shift
40 min./shift X 20 officers x 228 shifts	= 182,400 min./yr.
182,400 min./60min.	= 3,040 hrs. per yr.
3,040 hrs. /1,824 hrs. (COPS standard)	= 1.66 FTEs
1.66 FTE saved per year	

This is less than the required amount in the above calculation, but as demonstrated below, the department plans to use the MDTs for other uses also.



The department also states that it will use the laptops for report writing while its patrol officers are in their vehicles. Again, the laptops will be used by more than one (1) officer. Currently, each of the 20 officers spends two hours per shift writing reports. With the laptops, they believe they can save 1 hour per shift. The reports will have automated formats and can be sent for approval, via modem, versus driving back to the station.

The formula used to calculate the projected actual redeployment is:

$$\begin{aligned} 1 \text{ hr. per shift} \times 20 \text{ officers} \times 228 \text{ shifts} &= 4,560 \text{ hrs. per yr.} \\ 4,560 \text{ hrs.} / 1,824 \text{ hrs. (COPS standard)} &= 2.5 \text{ FTEs} \end{aligned}$$

So by saving 1.66 FTEs with the tag checks and 2.5 FTEs with the reports, the department projects a total redeployment of 4.1 FTEs, which is above the minimum required and the department receives the grant.

Redeployment Tracking Plan

The next task for the Neely County Sheriff's Department is to develop a redeployment tracking plan for its MORE grant. The agency begins its redeployment tracking plan with a short summary of the project and how it will save time for officers within the agency:

"The Neely County Sheriff's Department has been awarded a COPS MORE grant for 10 mobile data computers. These mobile data computers will be used as part of a pilot project to assess the effectiveness of automated field reporting in this agency. We believe that this new technology will allow patrol officers to perform quicker records checks and that it will make our reporting process more efficient. Through the assistance of the grant-funded technology, officers will be able to conduct their own records checks without going through dispatch. The field reporting system will reduce the need to enter duplicate information for accident and incident reports and will save officer travel time by allowing patrol officers to electronically transmit their reports to their supervisor."



The next part of the plan explains the method that the Neely County Sheriff's Department will use to track the timesavings from its grant-funded technology:

"The Neely County Sheriff's Department will track the timesavings from the grant-funded mobile data computers by comparing the survey results of the officers using the new equipment to the survey results (baseline) of the patrol officers writing reports prior to the implementation of the grant technology. For one week during each quarter, the 20 officers using the mobile data computers will track the number of records checks and reports that they write per day and how long these activities take them. Prior to the grant award, the Sheriff's Department completed log sheets, which demonstrated the time necessary to complete various checks and reports. The responses will be compared to determine the amount of timesavings produced by the new technology."

The final part of the redeployment tracking plan includes an explanation of how the time saved through this grant allowed this agency to enhance its community policing efforts:

"The officers using the computers will devote approximately one hour of their timesavings per day to problem-solving projects. During this time, the officers will contact community residents to identify community concerns and will work with community and city agencies to proactively address the causes of these concerns. The officers will respond to a minimal number of calls for service during this time."



Implementing the Redeployment Tracking Plan

The Neely County Sheriff's Department begins to implement its redeployment tracking plan once the grant-funded technology has been purchased and becomes fully operational. For one week during each quarter of the one-year redeployment tracking period, the agency requires officers to complete daily logs tracking how many reports and records checks are performed by officers and how long these activities take. These logs are completed by the 20 officers using the mobile data computers and compared to the time survey completed prior to the implementation of the technology. The results from the logs are used to form projections for timesavings over a one-year period.

Group One: 20 officers prior to technology implementation

	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4	Overall Averages
# Shifts	100	110	120	105	
Total hours report writing time	400	312	450	400	
Average hours writing reports per shift	4.00	3.12	3.75	3.80	3.67 hrs
Total hours for records checks	180	190	220	210	
Average hours performing records checks per shift	1.8	1.7	1.8	2.0	1.8 hrs

Group Two: 20 officers with mobile data computers

	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4	Overall Averages
# Shifts	100	110	120	105	
Total hours report writing time	306	312	400	320	
Average hours writing reports per shift	3.00	3.12	3.33	3.05	3.13 hrs
Total hours for records checks	150	200	180	130	
Average hours performing records checks per shift	1.5	1.8	1.5	1.2	1.5 hrs



Group One: 3.67 hrs. report writing per shift + 1.8 hrs.
performing records checks per shifts = 5.47 hrs.

Group Two: 3.13 hrs. report writing per shift + 1.5 hrs.
performing records checks per shifts = 4.63 hrs.

Time savings = 5.47 hrs. for officers without technology
- 4.63 hrs. for officers with technology
= 0.84 hrs saved per shift

0.84 hrs. per shift x 20 officers x 228 shifts
(COPS Office standard) = 3,830 hrs.

3,830 hrs./1,824 hrs. (COPS Office standard) = **2.1 FTEs saved**

In this case, the grantee demonstrated timesavings of 2.1 full-time equivalents. While its projected/actual redeployment fell short of the 3.03 FTE required redeployment for the grant, the grantee could document other unanticipated timesavings or other types of benefits which may have occurred as a result of the project to evaluate the project's effectiveness.

EXAMPLE 2: REDEPLOYMENT BY WEEK

The Snoutsville Police Department applies for a MORE grant to purchase a CAD/RMS system and 30 laptops. Currently, the department uses radio dispatch and all reports are done by hand. The department estimates that each of the 40 patrol officers currently spends about 15 hours per week writing reports and driving them back to the station for approval. If the department receives the MORE grant, it estimate that each officer will save approximately 7.5 hours per week. The cost of the system is \$230,000. To determine it required level of redeployment, the department would use the following formula that was laid out in the Cost Effectiveness Worksheet portion of the grant application.



Required Redeployment

Line 1	Entry level salary of SWORN police officer (as of Jan. 1, 1998)	1.	\$	36,000
Line 2	Fringe benefits of SWORN police officer (as of Jan. 1, 1998)	2.	\$	6,000
Line 3	Add lines 1 and 2	3.	\$	42,000
Line 4	Multiply line 3 by .75	4.	\$	31,500
Line 5	Enter figure on line 4 or \$25,000, whichever is less	5.	\$	25,000
Line 6	Total cost of item, system, or group of like items (100%)	6.	\$	230,000
Line 7	Federal amount requested.	7.	\$	172,500
	Can be no more than 75% of total item cost (line 6)			
Line 8	Divide line 7 by line 5	8.		6.9 FTEs

Projected/Actual Redeployment

The formula used to calculate the projected actual redeployment for this grant would be:

$$7.5 \text{ hrs.} \times 40 \text{ officers} \times 52 \text{ weeks} = 15,600 \text{ hrs. per yr.}$$

$$15,600 \text{ hrs.} / 1,824 \text{ hrs. (COPS standard)} = \mathbf{8.6 \text{ FTEs}}$$

The department exceeds the required redeployment level and is awarded the MORE grant.

Redeployment Tracking Plan

The Snoutsville Police Department must now come up with a plan to track redeployment once its system becomes operational. The agency begins its redeployment tracking plan with a short summary of the project and how it will save time for officers within the agency.

"The Snoutsville Police Department was awarded a grant to purchase and implement a new CAD/RMS system and MDTs to make our communications and report writing systems more efficient and effective. Prior to the implementation of the grant, the department estimates that each officer spends an average of 15 hours per week writing reports and driving them back to the station for processing. Through the use of our new CAD/RMS system and MDTs, we estimated that we could cut this time in half."

The next part of the plan is an explanation of the method that the Snoutsville Police Department will use to track the timesavings realized through the use of the funded equipment.

"In order to track the timesavings that officers will realize under this grant, we have issued log sheets to each officer and asked them to log in the time that is spent entering



reports into the laptop and sending them to headquarters through wireless transfer. On a weekly basis, we will use a sample based on the reports of 8 of the officers to determine the average amount of time that each officer saves as a result of the implementation of the CAD/RMS and MDTs."

Finally, the department describes how the timesavings it realizes will enhance its community policing efforts.

"With the time saved through the use of the grant-funded equipment, officers will attend community meetings with community and business leaders. The department will also begin a program to target high crime areas through increased foot/bike patrols."

Implementing the Tracking Plan

The department implements the grant, and each officer submits a time log at the end of the week showing timesavings that are achieved as a result of the grant. The log sheets are then totaled for each officer and entered into a spreadsheet tracking the timesavings that each officer realizes. Because tracking the timesavings for 40 officers is very time consuming, the department uses a sample of 8 officers who work varying shifts to determine timesavings across the department. A sample of the spreadsheet that they use to track the hours saved follows:

Officer	Sun	Mon	Tues	Wed	Thurs	Fri	Sat	Total
Dame	1.25	1.75			1.5	1	2	7.5
Chapman		1.5	1.5	2	1	1.25		7.25
Neely	1.5	1.5	1.25	1.75	2			8.0
Carey		1.75	1.75	2	1.5	1		8.0
Lynch	1	1.75			1.5	2	1.5	7.75
Carr	2	1.5	1.25	1.25			1.5	7.5
Ng	.5			1	2	1.25	1.25	7.0
Williams		2	1.75	1.5	1.5	1.25		8.0
Total	7.25	10.0	7.5	9.25	11.5	8.25	7.25	61.0



The department is able to tabulate on a weekly basis the timesavings that accrues over the course of the grant. When the COPS Count Operators call at the end of the first three months of fully operational status, the department reports that, on average (based on the sample), officers are spending 7.6 hours per week writing reports. These are timesavings of 7.4 hours per week. The following formula is used to determine the department's progress after 12 weeks:

$$7.4 \text{ hrs. per officer} \times 12 \text{ weeks} \times 40 \text{ officers} = 3,552 \text{ hrs. saved}$$
$$3,552 \text{ hrs.} / 1,824 \text{ hrs.} = 1.9 \text{ FTEs saved over 12 weeks.}$$

If the department remains on track with these levels of timesavings, they will achieve a total timesavings over a period of one year of 7.6 FTEs. Although this is slightly less timesavings than the originally projected, it still exceeds the required level of redeployment for the grant.

After the award, CAD/RMS system has been implemented, the department notices that its four (4) criminal investigators are also experiencing some unanticipated timesavings as a result of the grant. Since the Department now uses a records management system, the four detectives each save two hours per week because they no longer need to review lengthy handwritten reports that were poorly filed in the past. Now, the detectives have all of the available information on their computers, which is much faster than the old process. The department decides to track these timesavings as well since it will help them in exceeding their required redeployment level. Since each detective is saving an average of two hours per week, the following timesavings can be anticipated over the course of the year (this should be tracked incrementally as it accrues):

$$2 \text{ hrs. per week} \times 4 \text{ officers} \times 52 \text{ weeks} = 416 \text{ hrs.}$$
$$416 \text{ hrs.} / 1,824 \text{ hrs. (COPS Standard)} = .2 \text{ FTEs}$$

If the timesavings the department is currently achieving stays on track, they can expect to realize redeployment of 7.8 FTEs over the course of one year.

EXAMPLE 3: REDEPLOYMENT BY REPORT

The Sunshine Police Department applies for a MORE grant to purchase 12 laptop computers with supporting hardware and report writing software. Currently, all officers hand-write their reports. The department has a sworn force strength of 25 officers with four patrol officers assigned to each shift. Last year, the department generated a total of 28,763 reports. Each officer currently spends about 40



minutes writing each report and averages five reports per shift. If the department receives the MORE grant, it estimates that each officer will save approximately 20 minutes per report, cutting the time it takes to complete the reports in half. The cost of the laptops with supporting hardware/software is \$60,000. To determine required level of redeployment, the department uses the following formula which is laid out in the Cost Effectiveness Worksheet portion of the grant application.

Required Redeployment

Line 1	Entry level salary of SWORN police officer (as of Jan. 1, 1998)	1.	\$	23,000
Line 2	Fringe benefits of SWORN police officer (as of Jan. 1, 1998)	2.	\$	3,000
Line 3	Add lines 1 and 2	3.	\$	26,000
Line 4	Multiply line 3 by .75	4.	\$	19,500
Line 5	Enter figure on line 4 or \$25,000, whichever is less	5.	\$	19,500
Line 6	Total cost of item, system, or group of like items (100%)	6.	\$	60,000
Line 7	Federal amount requested.	7.	\$	45,000
	Can be no more than 75% of total item cost (line 6)			
Line 8	Divide line 7 by line 5	8.		2.3 FTEs

Projected/Actual Redeployment

Using the number of reports the department generated in the previous year, the department uses the following formula to calculate the projected actual redeployment for this grant;

$$\begin{aligned}
 28,763 \text{ reports per yr.} \times 20 \text{ min. per report} &= 575,260 \text{ min.} \\
 575,260 \text{ min.} / 60 \text{ min.} &= 9,587 \text{ hrs. saved} \\
 9,587 \text{ hrs. saved} / 1,824 \text{ hrs. (Cops standard)} &= \mathbf{5.3 \text{ FTEs}}
 \end{aligned}$$

The department exceeds the required redeployment level and is awarded the MORE grant.

Redeployment Tracking

The Sunshine Police Department must now develop a plan to track redeployment once its system becomes operational. The agency begins its redeployment tracking plan with a short summary of the project and how it will save time for officers within the agency.

"The Sunshine Police Department was awarded a grant to purchase 12 laptops with supporting hardware and report writing software to make writing reports more efficient. Prior to the implementation of the grant, the department estimated that each officer spent about 40 minutes writing each report. Through the use of the new laptops and report writing software, we estimate that we will cut this time in half."



The department then goes on to explain what method it will use to track the timesavings realized through the use of the laptops and report writing software.

"In order to track the timesavings that officers will realize under this grant, we have issued log sheets to each officer and asked them to log in the time that is spent entering reports into the laptop and sending them to headquarters through wireless transfer. On a monthly basis we will take a sample of the time logs for 12 officers on varying shifts to determine the average amount of time officers spend writing a report after the awarded equipment becomes operational."

The final part of the redeployment tracking plan includes an explanation of how the time saved through this grant will allow the department to enhance its community policing efforts.

"With the time saved through the use of the grant-funded equipment, the department will begin a school resource officer program in the high school. Additionally, we hope to begin conducting a citizen survey on crime and institute several neighborhood watch programs."

Implementing the Redeployment Tracking Plan

The department implements the grant and each officer submits a time log for each shift showing timesavings that is achieved as a result of the grant. The log sheets are then totaled for each officer and entered into a spreadsheet tracking the timesavings that each officer realizes. Because tracking the timesavings for 25 officers can be time consuming, the department uses a sample of 12 officers who work varying shifts to determine timesavings for the entire department. Using the log sheets, the department is able to create the following spreadsheet to determine how long it takes officers to do a report on average. A sample of the spreadsheet that they use to track the hours saved follows:



Officer	Reports per Shift	Time spent writing reports
Dame	8	180 minutes (3 hours)
Chapman	5	135 minutes (2.25 hours)
Neely	3	60 minutes (1 hour)
Carey	6	150 minutes (2.5 hours)
Lynch	6	150 minutes (2.5 hours)
Carr	2	30 minutes (.5 hours)
Ng	5	120 minutes (2 hours)
Williams	7	225 minutes (3.75 hours)
Dodge	6	150 minutes (2.5 hours)
Webb	8	180 minutes (3 hours)
Phillips	6	150 minutes (2.5 hours)
Alford	4	120 minutes (2 hours)
TOTAL	66	1,650 minutes (27.5 hours)

Three months after the equipment becomes fully operational, the department is able to tabulate on a daily basis the timesavings that accrues over the course of the grant. Based on the sample, the department finds that, on average, each officer spends 25 minutes per report. This results in timesavings of 15 minutes per report.

1,650 min. / 66 reports = 25 min. per report
 40 min. per report (prior to grant) - 25 min. per report (post grant) =
 15 min. in savings per report

Over the three-month period, the department has generated 7,230 reports. Therefore, their timesavings, to date, can be calculated as follows:

7,230 reports x 15 min. per report = 108,450 min.
 108,450 min. /60 min. = 1,807 hrs. saved
 1,807 hrs. saved / 1,824 hrs. (COPS standard) = **1 FTE**



If the department continues to see this level of timesavings for the remainder of the 12 months, they can expect to realize redeployment of 4 FTE. Although this is slightly fewer timesavings than they originally estimated, it still exceeds the required level of redeployment for the grant. After the laptops have been implemented, the department notices that there are additional timesavings that occur as a result of the grant, including:

- electronically transferring reports to supervisor instead of driving reports to headquarters, and
- electronic revisions after review instead of re-writing reports.

EXAMPLE 4: REDEPLOYMENT BY ARREST

Two years ago, arrest processing in the Gotham City Police Department meant transporting a prisoner to a central location in downtown Gotham, manually fingerprinting and capturing arrest data, taking the arrestee's photograph, and then transporting the prisoner to court for arraignment. The backup of prisoners caused delays and officers have, on occasion, spent as much as 10 hours processing an arrest! The arrest processing procedures consisted of manually fingerprinting and photographing a suspect, entering the suspect's information into the department's centralized booking system, and then transporting the prisoner to the District Attorney to complete the booking process. On average, Gotham police officers spent 8 hours per arrest completing the procedures required to process an arrested suspect.

The Gotham City Police Department applied for a MORE grant to purchase an arrest processing system, including video conferencing, Live Scan fingerprinting, photo imaging, warrant checks, and automated arrest data processing.

Line 1	Entry level salary of SWORN police officer	1.	\$	30,000
Line 2	Fringe benefits of SWORN police officer	2.	\$	8,500
Line 3	Add lines 1 and 2	3.	\$	38,500
Line 4	Multiply line 3 by .75	4.	\$	28,875
Line 5	Enter figure on line 4 or \$25,000, whichever is less	5.	\$	25,000
Line 6	Total cost of item, system, or group of like items (100%)	6.	\$	10,000,000
Line 7	Federal amount requested.	7.	\$	7,500,000
Can be no more than 75% of total item cost (line 6)				
Line 8	Divide line 7 by line 5	8.		300 FTEs



Projected/Actual Redeployment

The formula used to calculate the projected or actual redeployment for this grant would be:

Timesavings per arrest

Travel time to central booking	1.5 hours
Report writing and mug shots	.5 hours
Pro-rated travel time to fax & re-fingerprint rejected prints	.5 hours
Travel time for affidavit issuance	1.5 hours

Total timesavings 4.0 hours

136,800 arrests per year (September 1998-September 1999)

136,800 x 4 hrs. saved = 547,200 hrs. saved

547,200 hrs. saved / 1,824 hrs. = **300 FTEs redeployed**

With the help of a COPS MORE grant, the Gotham City Police Department has now completely decentralized its arrest processing system. The GCPD's arrest processing system is now composed of five major automated components, including Live Scan fingerprinting, photo imaging, warrant checks, automated arrest data processing, and video conferencing. The Live Scan units, photo imaging, video conferencing equipment, and the upgraded on-line booking system were purchased in 1997 and were completely operational in September 1998. Operationally, Live Scan has eliminated the need to manually ink and record an arrestee's fingerprints. It generates computerized files of an individual's prints by guiding the user through the process and rejecting poor quality prints as they are generated, eliminating "bad prints" and the need for reprinting suspects. The prints are then transmitted to the Department of Criminal Justice Services at the State Capitol for further analysis, and to central records for storage. The photo imaging and warrant system takes, stores, and retrieves images for each of the city's five prisoner holding facilities. All precincts throughout the city have the ability to display and print the photos. Video conferencing is used in each of the precincts, eliminating the need to travel to the District Attorney's office to complete the arrest affidavit.

Redeployment Summary

With the installation of the automated components that comprise the department's decentralized booking function, it now takes approximately four hours to process an arrest.



Before the decentralization afforded by the MORE technology, officers had to transport arrestees to a centralized booking facility for arrest processing. After the implementation of the technology, officers no longer spend an inordinate amount of time travelling (sometimes in city or rush hour traffic) to and from the precinct to the centralized booking facility. Based on calculated averages of a sample of officers across all the affected precincts, one and one-half (**1½ hours per arrest**) are saved through the elimination of travel time to the central booking facility.

Prior to the implementation of the on-line booking system, officers were required to complete multiple written reports that often captured duplicative information. Additionally, the processing time for mug shot photographs added time to the booking process. With the implementation of an on-line booking system and digital mug shot processing, the time to process an arrest has been reduced by **30 minutes per arrest** by eliminating duplicative paperwork and reducing the time spent taking and developing photographs.

Prior to Live Scan, three fingerprint cards were inked and then faxed to the State Capitol. Some precincts did not have a fax machine that would provide the level of graphic detail required to transmit the prints, also resulting in travel time that is no longer needed. If prints sent to the State Capitol were rejected, the arresting officer was required to reprint the arrestee and go through this process again. If an arrestee had been moved to a different holding facility, time was spent tracking the arrestee down. Based on the proportion of prints that required travel to an upgraded fax machine (approximately one-fifth (1/5) of all arrestee prints), and the proportion of prints that required reprinting due to rejection at the State capital (approximately one-fourth (1/4) of all arrestee prints), an average of **30 minutes per arrest** is saved through this automated booking technology.

The last step in the booking process involved transporting arrestees to the District Attorney's Office for issuing arrest affidavits. The video conferencing equipment installed as part of the upgraded arrest processing function has virtually eliminated all travel between the precinct and DA's office for issuing arrest affidavits as all arrestee questioning is now conducted in the local precinct via video teleconferencing. The video teleconferencing component of the arrest processing system has yielded an average officer timesavings of **1½ hours per arrest**.

With the implementation of Live Scan, along with the other components of the system, an offender is printed and photographed automatically, data is entered directly into the booking system from the precinct (paperless reporting), and the arrest affidavit is completed via



video-teleconferencing. Redeployment occurs by eliminating the need to perform routine multiple prints, waiting time for receiving confirmation from the State Capitol, in reprinting rejected prints, taking manual photographs, and most importantly, by reducing travel time to and from the precinct to the central booking facility and the District Attorney's Office. In sum, the new technology has permitted the Gotham City Police Department to save police officer arrest processing time citywide.

Calculation

Redeployment Requirement = 300 FTEs, based on an awarded amount of \$7,500,000 (\$7,500,000/\$25,000 maximum allowable per FTE = 300 FTEs)

Timesavings per arrest

Travel time to central booking	1.5 hours
Report writing and mug shots	.5 hours
Pro-rated travel time to fax & re-fingerprint rejected prints	.5 hours
Travel time for affidavit issuance	1.5 hours
Total Timesavings	4.0 hours

136,800 arrests per year (September 1998-September 1999)

136,800 x 4 hrs. saved = 547,200 hrs. saved

547,200 hrs. saved / 1,824 hrs. = **300 FTEs redeployed**

300 FTEs redeployed into community policing since the equipment became fully operational in September 1998.

Unanticipated Timesavings

Because both mug shots and fingerprints are now stored electronically in a centralized citywide database, detectives who formerly used to scour through paper files for hours on end can now search the fingerprint and mug shot archives during the investigative process.

Based on a survey of the detectives conducted in the detective bureau, detectives are now saving an average of 1 hour per search.

Timesavings of 1 hour per search

One hour per either fingerprint or mug shot search x 300,000 searches per year citywide (September 1998-September 1999) = 300,000 hrs. saved.

300,000 hrs. saved / 1,824 hrs.

= **164.5 FTEs of unanticipated timesavings for detectives**

TOTAL FTEs Redeployed: 300 + 164.5 = 464.5



Redeployment Tracking

The Gotham City Police Department must now come up with a plan to track redeployment once its system becomes operational. Using the guidelines provided in the Redeployment Tracking Q&A Fact Sheet provided by the COPS Office, the department prepares the following tracking plan.

"The Gotham City Police Department was awarded a grant to purchase and implement a new arrest processing system to significantly reduce the time spent by police officers processing arrestees. Prior to the implementation of the new system, the department documented the time spent by randomly sampling 25 officers (across the department) and tracking their time during each phase of the arrest process, which includes: the transport time, fingerprint processing time, time spent completing several required paper reports, and the time spent in the issuance of arrest affidavits by the prosecuting attorney (includes transport and holding time). This entire process averaged 8 hours across the 25 sampled arresting officers. With the installation of the multiple component arrest processing system, we estimated that this time would be reduced by 50 percent. In order to validate these estimates, we waited until all components of the arrest processing system were fully operational, which was approximately 18 months after receiving the grant award. We then ran the same time tests for each of the components of the arrest process on another sample of 25 arresting officers on a quarterly basis for one year after becoming fully operational with the arrest processing and booking system."

The quarterly time test employed by the Gotham City P.D. takes into consideration the potential improvements in efficiencies to be experienced by the members of the department. Simply put, as officers become familiarized with the automation and the new arrest processing system, the time saved could presumably increase. By sampling 25 officers each quarter, and tracking/documenting their activities during the arrest process, the Gotham City P.D. is in a good position to then come up with a reasonable average for the number of hours saved per arrest, which could then be applied to the total number of arrests per year.



The following is the formula used to determine the actual timesavings department-wide (formula would need to be applied quarterly, at minimum, with each subsequent sample time test period):

Total hours of time saved per arrest =
 Total of transportation time saved
 + Booking/mug-shots
 + Fingerprinting
 + Issuance of arrest affidavits

Total time saved x number of arrests for the quarter
 = number of hours saved/COPS standard (1,824 hrs)
 = number of FTEs redeployed

In this case, assuming they met their projected levels, they would save 4 hours per arrest x 34,200 arrests in the quarter, resulting in 136,800 hours saved, or 75 FTEs redeployed, in the quarter. This process would need to be repeated until the full year is complete, which would then yield the total timesavings/redeployment that would be reported to the COPS Office.

EXAMPLE 5: TASK-ORIENTED CIVILIAN REDEPLOYMENT

The Wickersville Police Department applies for a MORE grant to hire four civilian Police Aides to assist with answering non-emergency calls for service. Currently, the department estimates that each officer spends about three (3) hours per shift answering non-emergency calls for service. The department has a sworn force strength of 34 officers with six patrol officers assigned to each shift. If the department receives the MORE grant, it estimate that each officer will save approximately 1.5 hours per shift as a result of the civilian hires. The cost of hiring these 4 civilians is \$100,000 including salary and benefits. To determine its required level of redeployment, the department would use the following formula that was laid out in the Cost Effectiveness Worksheet portion of the grant application.

Line 1	Entry level salary of SWORN police officer (as of Jan. 1, 1998)	1.	\$	28,500
Line 2	Fringe benefits of SWORN police officer (as of Jan. 1, 1998)	2.	\$	6,800
Line 3	Add lines 1 and 2	3.	\$	35,300
Line 4	Multiply line 3 by .75	4.	\$	26,475
Line 5	Enter figure on line 4 or \$25,000, whichever is less	5.	\$	25,000
Line 6	Total cost of item, system, or group of like items (100%)	6.	\$	100,000
Line 7	Federal amount requested.	7.	\$	75,000
	Can be no more than 75% of total item cost (line 6)			
Line 8	Divide line 7 by line 5	8.		3.0 FTEs



Projected/Actual Redeployment

Using the estimated number of hours that these civilians could save each officer per shift, the department uses the following formula to calculate the projected actual redeployment for this grant:

1.5 hrs. per officer per shift x 34 officers x 228 shifts = 11,628 hrs. saved
 $11,628 / 1,824 \text{ hrs} = \mathbf{6.4 \text{ FTEs}}$

The department exceeds the required redeployment level and is awarded the MORE grant.

Redeployment Tracking

The Wickersville Police Department must now come up with a plan to track redeployment once the civilian positions have all been hired and received the necessary training. Using the guidelines provided in the Redeployment Tracking Q&A Fact Sheet provided by the COPS Office, the department prepares the following tracking plan. The first portion provides a short summary of the project.

"The Wickersville Police Department was awarded a grant to hire 4 civilian Police Aides to assist the department in handling non-emergency calls for service. Prior to the implementation of the grant, the department estimated that each officer spent about three hours per shift answering these types of calls for service. By hiring the civilian Police Aides, we still estimate that we have cut this time in half."

Next, the department explains the method planned to use to track the timesavings resulting from the hiring of the civilian police aides.

"In order to track the timesavings that officers will realize under this grant, we have issued log sheets to each officer and asked them to log in the time that they spend each shift on non-emergency calls for service. On a monthly basis, we will take a sample of the sheets for 10 officers on varying shifts to determine the average amount of time per shift that they spend answering non-emergency calls for service after the civilian police aides are hired and trained."



Finally, the department details the community policing activities that they plan to implement as a result of the time saved as a result of the grant.

"With the time saved through the hiring of these civilians, the department will set up a "hot spot" analysis program to target high crime areas."

Implementing the Redeployment Tracking Plan

The department implements the grant, and each officer submits a time log each shift showing timesavings that is achieved as a result of the grant. The log sheets are then totaled for each officer and entered into a spreadsheet tracking the timesavings that each officer realizes. Once the civilians are hired, the department finds that only 24 officers will benefit from them because they will not be working the 3rd shift. Because tracking the timesavings for 24 officers is very time consuming, the department uses a sample of 10 officers who work varying shifts to determine timesavings across the department. Using the log sheets, the department is able to create the following spreadsheet to determine how long it takes officers to do a report on average. A sample of the spreadsheet that they use to track the hours saved follows:

Officer	# of non-emergency calls	Hours spent on non-emergency calls
Ng	3	2
Dillion	1	1
Roberts	2	1.5
Lynch	2	2.5
Conyers	3	3
Carroll1	1	1
Beamon	4	3
Hilliard	3	2
Carey	2	1.5
Carr	3	2.5
Total	24	20



Three months after the civilians are hired, the department is able to tabulate on a daily basis the timesavings that accrue over the course of the grant. The department finds that, on average (based on the sample), each officer is spending two hours per shift answering non-emergency calls for service. This results in an average of one hour of timesavings per officer per shift. The department calculates the timesavings to date as follows:

$$1 \text{ hr.} \times 24 \text{ Officers} \times 57 \text{ shifts (1/4 of 228)} = 1,368 \text{ hrs. saved}$$
$$1,368 \text{ hrs.} / 1,824 \text{ hrs. (COPS standard)} = \mathbf{.8 \text{ FTEs}}$$

If the department continues to see this level of timesavings for the remainder of the 12 months, they can expect to realize redeployment of 3.2 FTEs. This is less timesavings than what the department had originally projected, but it still exceeds the required level of redeployment. The department attributes the reduced savings to the fact that officers on the late shift do not have the benefit of the civilians who only work the first two shifts of the day.

Appendix E: Reference Material

U.S. Department of Justice Grant Policies

Financial Guide: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of the Comptroller; Current Edition.

Universal Hiring Program Grant Owner's Manual: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services

COPS in Schools Grant Owner's Manual: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services

COPS MORE '95 Grant Owner's Manual: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services

COPS MORE '96 Grant Owner's Manual: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services

COPS MORE '98 Grant Owner's Manual: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services

COPS MORE 2000 Grant Owner's Manual: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services

COPS MORE 2001 Grant Owner's Manual: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services

COPS MORE 2002 Grant Owner's Manual: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services

Statutes

Public Safety Partnership and Community Policing Act of 1994
42 U.S.C. § 3796dd *et seq.*

Administrative Requirements:

OMB Circular A-102, "Grants and Cooperative Agreements with State and Local Governments"



OMB Circular A-110, "Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Non-Profit Organizations"

Cost Principles:

OMB Circular A-21, "Cost Principles for Educational Institutions"

OMB Circular A-87, "Cost Principles for State, Local, and Indian Tribal Governments"

OMB Circular A-122, "Cost Principles for Non-Profit Organizations"

Audit Requirements:

OMB Circular A-133, "Audits of States, Local Governments and Non-profit Organizations"

Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended (Title 5 U.S.C. Appendix 3)

Code of Federal Regulations:

4 CFR Parts 101-105, Department of Justice/General Accounting Office, "Joint Federal Claims Collections Standards"

5 CFR Part 1320, "Controlling Paperwork Burdens on the Public"

5 CFR Part 151, "Political Activity of State or Local Officers or Employees"

28 CFR Part 23, "Criminal Intelligence Systems Operating Policies"

28 CFR Part 30, "Intergovernmental Review of Department of Justice Programs and Activities"

28 CFR Part 42, "Nondiscrimination; Equal Employment Opportunity; Policies and Procedures"

28 CFR Part 66, "Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments"



28 CFR Part 70 , "Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements With Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals and Other Non-Profit Organizations"

28 CFR Part 67, "Government-wide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace (Grants)"

28 CFR Part 69, " New Restrictions on Lobbying"

31 CFR Part 205, "Rules and Procedures for Efficient Federal and State Funds Transfers"

Executive Order 12549, " Debarment and Suspension"

Executive Order 12372, "Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs"

Executive Order 12291 "Federal Regulation"

Grant Monitoring Standards and Guidelines for Hiring and Redeployment

Index



INDEX

A

Acceptable Sources of Matching Funds, 41
 Actual/Projected Level of Redeployment, 81
 Accepted Salary, 64, 65, 66
 AHEAD (Accelerated, Hiring, Education, and Development) 1, 9, 10, 33, 39, 44, 71, 74, 84, 101
 Allowable Costs, 1, 16, 21, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 64, 65, 66, 81, 84
 Approved Allowable Costs, 33, 37
 Approved Benefits, 33, 34, 39, 65, 66
 Approved Salary, (See Accepted Salary)
 Approved Technology and Equipment, 44
 Auditing Requirements, 13
 Authorized Officials, 81

B

Baseline, 32, 42, 43, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 55, 70, 72, 81, 82, 85, 88, 94, 107
 BIA (Bureau of Indian Affairs) funds, 23, 41, 42, 43, 44, 47, 48, 49, 71, 72, 73, 81, 82, 85, 88
 Budget Documentation, 44

C

Career Law Enforcement Officer, 23, 88
 Cash Match, 40, 41, 68
 Changes, 18, 22, 23, 59, 61
 CIS (COPS in Schools) grantee, 1, 9, 10, 21, 23, 24, 26, 33, 38, 39, 40, 46, 49, 50, 52, 61, 64, 65, 67, 70, 74, 75, 82, 101
 Civilian Hires, Civilian Hiring, 33, 34, 39, 49, 66, 81, 121
 Civilian Positions, 28, 29, 33, 39, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 72, 73, 88, 122
 Close Out, 52
 Community Partnerships, 25, 27, 61
 Community Policing, 1, 5, 9, 10, 16, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 34, 36, 38, 50, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 59, 61, 76, 77, 81, 82, 84, 85, 87, 88, 89, 107, 111, 114, 119, 123, 125
 Complaint Reviews, 13, 15

Conditions, 1, 17, 19, 21, 22, 24, 29, 32, 33, 39, 41, 42, 45, 50, 54, 59, 62, 63, 64, 86, 87, 93
 COPS Audit Division, 17
 COPS in Schools (CIS), 1, 9, 10, 23, 52, 61, 75, 82, 101, 125
 CIS Grantees, 1, 39, 52, 75
 COPS in Schools Officers, (See School Resource Officer)
 COPS On-Site Program Reviews, 14

D

Delays in Filling Vacant Locally-Funded Sworn Officer Positions or Civilian Positions, 43, 45
 Department Annual Report, 49, 50, 74
 Department Initial Report, 49, 50, 74
 Draw Downs, 97

E

Early Hire, 45, 101
 Early Purchase, 45
 Enhance Community Policing, 22, 24, 38, 53, 56, 85, 87, 89
 Entry-Level Officer, 10, 67
 Equipment, 14, 24, 28, 29, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 49, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 59, 62, 63, 65, 66, 67, 73, 74, 76, 77, 81, 85, 87, 88, 89, 93, 95, 107, 110, 111, 114, 115, 117, 118
 Exception to Pre-Award Hiring Prohibition, 45
 Exemption from the Retention Requirement, 30
 Extensions, 59, 65, 68, 82, 83

F

FAST, 1, 9, 10, 32, 33, 39, 44, 48, 71, 74, 84, 101
 Final Reports, 52
 Financial Reviews, 15, 16
 Financial Status Reports (FSR or 269A), 15, 16, 49, 50, 51, 52, 74, 88, 96, 97
 (FTE) Full-Time Equivalency, Full-Time Equivalent, 53, 54, 55, 56, 77, 81, 82, 84, 85, 86, 87, 105, 106, 109, 110, 112, 113, 115, 116, 117, 119, 121, 122, 124



Full-Time Positions, 64
Full-Time Sworn Officers, 33

G

Grant Award Period, 53, 87
Grant Number, 83, 88

H

Hiring Grant Funding Period, 29, 30, 63, 83
Hiring Grants, 1, 9, 22, 23, 24, 28, 30, 32, 33, 34,
35, 36, 40, 42, 44, 47, 48, 49, 61, 62, 63, 64,
65, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 74, 94, 101
Hiring Sworn Officers or Civilians, 43, 44

I

Independent Audits, 16

L

Lateral Transferred Officer, 84
Legal Reviews and Guidance, 13, 15
Local Funding, Local Funds, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32,
33, 34, 35, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 45, 48, 62, 63,
65, 66, 68, 71, 73, 84, 93, 94, 95
Local Match Guidelines, 39
Locally-Funded, 23, 28, 34, 35, 36, 42, 43, 45, 46,
47, 48, 49, 50, 59, 70, 71, 72, 73, 82, 93, 94

M

Matching Funds, 1, 21, 38, 40, 41, 67, 68, 69, 84,
93
Mitigating Circumstances, 30, 31, 63
Modification (See Changes)
Monitoring, 1, 13, 14, 15, 29, 35, 55, 82
MORE '95, 10, 33, 34, 36, 38, 42, 54, 55, 62, 65,
77, 81, 86, 87, 89, 101, 125,
MORE '96, 36, 54, 38, 62, 86, 89, 101, 125
MORE '98, 28, 36, 38, 54, 62, 86, 89, 101, 125
MORE '00, 37, 38, 54, 62, 77, 86, 89, 101, 125
MORE '01, 37, 54, 55, 77, 85, 86, 89, 101, 125
MORE '02, 37, 53, 54, 55, 76, 77, 85, 86, 87, 89,
101, 125

MORE (Making Officer Redeployment
Effective) Grants, 1, 9, 10, 14, 15, 16, 21, 24,
28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39,
40, 42, 44, 45, 47, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55,
56, 59, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 72, 73,
74, 76, 77, 81, 82, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 93,
95, 96, 101, 105, 106, 109, 110, 112, 113,
116, 117, 118, 121, 122, 125

N

Nonsupplanting, 32, 41, 42, 43, 46, 47, 48, 81,
85, 94, 95, 96

O

OBGR (Office-Based Grant Reviews), 14
Obligation of Funds, 84
OIG (Office of the Inspector General) Audits,
13, 16
One Full Local Budget Cycle, 28, 29, 30, 31, 62,
63, 83, 86
On-Site Financial Reviews, 15
Overtime, 10, 24, 29, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 42,
53, 54, 55, 62, 65, 77, 81

P

Partnerships, 21, 25, 26, 27, 28, 61
Part-Time Positions, 48, 71, 73
Part-Time to Full-Time Promotions, 45
PHASE I, 1, 9, 29, 33, 50, 62, 63, 101
(PHS) Police Hiring Supplement, 1, 9
Pre-award, 22, 42, 43, 44, 45, 59, 96
Problem Solving, 21, 24, 25, 27, 61, 82, 84, 107
Program Progress Report, 13, 15, 49, 74, 88
Program Progress Report Reviews, 13, 15
Project Costs, 38, 39, 40, 68
Public Safety Partnership and Community
Policing Act of 1994, 84, 125

**R**

Realized Redeployment, 85
Redeployment, 1, 9, 10, 14, 16, 21, 24, 28, 29, 30, 34, 35, 36, 37, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 59, 62, 63, 76, 77, 81, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 101, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 112, 113, 114, 116, 117, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124
Redeployment Tracking, 55, 76, 77, 85, 89, 105, 106, 107, 108, 110, 113, 114, 120, 123
Redeployment Tracking Plan, 85, 89, 106, 107, 108, 110, 113, 114, 123
Reduction in Baseline Funding in Sworn Personnel, 85
Reduction-in-Force, 32
Rehired Officer, 33, 35, 81, 86
Renewal, 33, 34, 35, 53, 54, 65, 67, 77, 81
Reporting, 1, 16, 21, 49, 50, 52, 74, 96, 97, 106, 118
Required Level of Redeployment, 29, 30, 62, 63, 81, 86, 87, 105, 109, 112, 113, 116, 121, 124
Retention, 1, 16, 21, 28, 29, 30, 31, 47, 50, 62, 63, 83, 86
Retention Plan, 29, 30, 31, 62
Retention Planning, 28, 29, 31, 62

S

School Resource Officer, 10, 23, 25, 38, 52, 70, 82, 114,
State Funds, 41, 127
Supplanting, 1, 15, 16, 21, 32, 41, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 70, 71, 72, 73, 87, 88, 93, 94, 95, 101
Supplement, 1, 9, 14, 15, 40, 41, 68, 70, 81, 84, 88
Support Services, 24, 39, 48, 53, 65, 66, 67, 73, 88
Suspension, 13, 17, 127
Sworn, 23, 27, 33, 34, 35, 42, 43, 47, 49, 70, 81, 85, 88, 94, 105, 110, 112, 113, 116, 121
Sworn Officer, 10, 23, 24, 28, 29, 33, 34, 36, 37, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 53, 54, 55, 56, 70, 75, 76, 81, 82, 85, 87, 88, 94, 95

T

Technology, 5, 21, 24, 28, 29, 33, 34, 35, 38, 39, 42, 43, 44, 45, 49, 53, 54, 55, 56, 59, 62, 63, 65, 66, 67, 73, 76, 77, 81, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 93, 95, 106, 107, 108, 109, 118, 119
Termination of Grant Funding, 17
Threshold Review Date, 47, 88, 101
Timesavings for Redeployment, 1, 21, 53, 54, 55, 76, 77
Tracking Plan, 55, 56, 76, 77, 85, 89, 106, 107, 108, 110, 111, 113, 114, 120, 122, 123
Tracking Timesavings, 54
Tracking Timesavings/Redeployment, 89

U

UHP (Universal Hiring Program), 1, 9, 10, 24, 31, 32, 33, 39, 48, 50, 74, 83, 84, 88, 101
Unallowable Costs, 35, 37

V

Veteran Officer, 10, 22, 23, 34, 36, 61

W

Waiver, 38, 39, 41, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 84
Written Approval, 33, 35, 44, 45

FOR MORE INFORMATION:

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Community Oriented Policing Services
1100 Vermont Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20530

To obtain details on COPS programs, call the
COPS Office Response Center at 800.421.6770

Visit COPS Online at www.cops.usdoj.gov

e08042459

Created Date: September 16, 2004

