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1. PROGRAM: IACP / AMU CIVILIAN LAW ENFORCEMENT – MILITARY COOPERATION AWARD

The Civilian Law Enforcement – Military Cooperation Committee (CLEMCC) of the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) promotes closer cooperation between civilian and military law enforcement agencies worldwide. The committee sponsors this award, in association with American Military University, to recognize cooperative efforts that lead to better law enforcement.

CLEMCC was organized in order to encourage civilian law enforcement and military officials to take advantage of each other’s skills, knowledge and resources and find common ground where they can support each other’s efforts. The IACP believes this will lead to greater public safety for the communities they both serve.

Some examples of cooperation include: Conducting joint training; successful joint investigations; information sharing; joint intervention programs, (juvenile gangs, drugs, domestic violence); joint security programs; joint veteran transition programs; mutual EOD/EDD support programs; resource and facility sharing; involvement in each other’s community programs; or any other innovative cooperative effort that leads to a demonstrated improvement in public safety.

The Civilian Law Enforcement – Military Cooperation Award will be presented in recognition of this cooperative spirit. Awards will be presented to both participants of the cooperative program at the IACP annual conference.

2. AWARD PROGRAM GUIDELINES

2.1 The program must demonstrate that the intent of the IACP program for agency cooperation has been reached and resulted in a positive outcome for both the civilian and military communities.

2.2 Agencies must submit the project/program cooperatively, or, if a single agency wishes to submit an entry, a letter of endorsement must accompany the entry form from the cooperating agency.

2.3 Judging will be based on information contained in the narrative entry, which explains the program. The entry narrative is limited to a one page “Executive Summary.” Supporting documentation will be a “detailed project narrative” of no more than five to six pages.

2.4 The supporting information may consist of brochures the project/program produced, photographs, news accounts on the project/program, and testimonials from those assisted by the project/program.

2.5 The entry must have the signature blocks of both the civilian and military agency authorities responsible for the project/program.

2.6 Judging will be done by a subcommittee of CLEMCC, made up of a chairperson, two civilian, and two military members.
2.7 Nomination packets should be submitted in hard copy, with an electronic copy follow up.

3. **HOW TO ENTER**

3.1 Award program applications should include the following information for both the civilian and military organizations:

3.1.1 Name of the organizations.
3.1.2 Name of the jurisdictions represented.
3.1.3 Addresses of the organizations.
3.1.4 Telephone numbers, fax numbers, and emails for the organizations.
3.1.5 Contact persons – individual(s) filling out the application. Include each organization’s address, telephone, fax, and email address (REQUIRED).
3.1.6 Population figures for the jurisdictions served.
3.1.7 Number of sworn staff in each organization.

3.2 It would be helpful to the judges – and to other organizations – to have answers to the following questions (may be submitted as an addendum to the application page):

3.2.1 How was the decision made to begin the civilian/military dialogue?
3.2.2 What was the result of the first meeting?
3.2.3 Do you meet on a regular basis? How often?
3.2.4 Describe the typical meeting. Who presides? Is there a speaker? A presenter?
3.2.5 What type of information do you generally exchange?
3.2.6 Do you meet within both jurisdictions?
3.2.7 Do you find the cooperative effort worthwhile enough that you would recommend it to other civilian/military jurisdictions?

3.3 Entry deadline: **June 27, 2014**

3.4 Entry Address: Civilian Law Enforcement – Military Cooperation Award
International Association of Chiefs of Police
Attn: Ian Hamilton
44 Canal Center Plaza, Suite 200,
Alexandria, VA 22314 USA

And email to: hamilton@theiacp.org

3.5 IACP Contact Person: Ian Hamilton,
703/647.6848 or 1 800-THE-IACP
Fax: 703-836-4543
e-mail: hamilton@theiacp.org

4. **AWARD TIMELINES (2014)**

27 Jun Application Deadline to IACP

11 Jul Award Judging Packets to Awards Subcommittee
Judging

8 Aug Judging results returned to Awards Subcommittee Chair (Score Track Sheet)

15 Aug Recommended award winner to CLEMCC Co Chairs for approval

22 Aug Award winner (partner military and civilian LEAs) notified of their status and invited to receive their awards at the annual IACP Conference.


5. AWARD JUDGING CRITERIA

6.1 Project Selection: 10 points

Project may focus on either timely agency or community issues. Direct input from both agencies and community members should be described. Specific goals, forecasted improvements and a time schedule should be clearly described.

Judging: How was project chosen? Is proper input from both agencies and community members clearly described? Is the project clearly defined? Are there clear-cut objectives and a time schedule?

6.2 Project Design/Solutions: 25 points

The description of possible solutions to determine the most innovative cooperative approach should be clear and concise. A strong case for the solution chosen must be stated. A clear understanding of what was expected to be accomplished must be demonstrated: whether the problem was to be prevented, contained (to stop it from spreading), or solved (eliminated permanently). The implementation plan should be clearly defined, with documentation and regular meetings to analyze and re-evaluate any progress. Finally, the plan of action should demonstrate innovation and creativity in the methods used to determine the solution and in the solution itself.

Judging: Were various solution alternatives examined? Was a strong case for the chosen solution stated? Was the solution an attempt to contain a problem or solve it entirely? Did the implementation plan include regular analysis and re-evaluation? Was innovation demonstrated?

6.3 Project Evaluation: 10 points

There should be a clear description of the evaluation of the project’s progress. In this area, participants will be judged on the effectiveness of using evaluation techniques to support project completion.
Judging: Were ways developed to chart and evaluate project progress? Were these evaluation techniques used to evaluate the results with respect to the original project goals?

6.4 Results: 30 points

Participating agencies must clearly show that they achieved what they set out to achieve. Quality of the results is more important than the quantity (size/scope) of the results. Therefore, an agency that can document positive, lasting change within a small section of the departments or community may score higher than an agency that reports widespread but non-maintainable changes.

In addition, other positive results that have come about as a by-product of the project should be stated. These effects will be evaluated for overall positive impact and for how well they have been documented and verified.

Judging: Did the project achieve what it expected to achieve? Are the results the direct outcome of the skills and agency cooperation applied throughout the process? Did the results measure favorably against the difficulty of achievement? Were there other positive effects besides those originally intended?

6.5 Institutionalization: 20 points

Institutionalization requires that improvement is maintainable over an extended period of time, and it can occur on several levels. It may consist of procedural changes, equipment upgrades, or ongoing training programs within the cooperating agencies. Or it may consist of a lasting impact within the community that can be sustained and furthered. Consideration will also be given if your project shows promise as a cooperative model to be emulated by other law enforcement agencies.

Judging: Are the positive results of the project maintainable over time? Is the cooperative project readily adaptable to other agencies and organizations?

6.6 Submission: 5 points

The project submission should be clear and concise, and should follow a logical sequence from problem identification and analysis through implementation, results, and institutionalization. Particular emphasis should be placed on the improvement process. Charts, graphs, and other media articles may be used as attachments to help illustrate how the project developed and to support its findings and direction.

Judging: Is all documentation clear and concise? Does it follow a logical sequence? Is the primary emphasis on the improvement process? Does the back up material clearly relate to the project?