

Notices regarding the solicitation “Research and Evaluation on the Administration of Justice”

April 11, 2018: NIJ hosted a webinar discussion on April 4, 2018, that provided an overview of this solicitation. The transcripts and slides have been appended to this document.

April 2, 2018: A sentence was redacted under “New Investigator/Early Career Opportunity” in Section A. Program Description.

April 2, 2018: Item 9.c. titled “Disclosure of Process Related to Executive Compensation” under “What an Application Should Include” in Section D. Application and Submission Information was redacted.

The original solicitation document begins on the next page.



The [U.S. Department of Justice](#) (DOJ), [Office of Justice Programs](#) (OJP), [National Institute of Justice](#) (NIJ) is seeking applications for funding investigator-initiated, interdisciplinary research and evaluation projects related to the administration of justice in three areas: (1) eyewitness evidence; (2) front-end intervention strategies; and (3) enhancing investigation and prosecution. This program furthers the Department's mission by sponsoring research to provide objective, independent, evidence-based knowledge and tools to meet the challenges of crime and justice, particularly at the state and local levels.

Research and Evaluation on the Administration of Justice

Applications Due: May 14, 2018

Eligibility

In general, NIJ is authorized to make grants to, or enter into contracts or cooperative agreements with, States (including territories), units of local government, federally recognized Indian tribal governments that perform law enforcement functions (as determined by the Secretary of the Interior), nonprofit and for-profit organizations (including tribal nonprofit and for-profit organizations), institutions of higher education (including tribal institutions of higher education), and certain qualified individuals. Foreign governments, foreign organizations, and foreign colleges and universities are not eligible to apply. Federal agencies are eligible to apply. (Any award made to a federal agency will be made as an interagency reimbursable agreement.)

All recipients and subrecipients (including any for-profit organization) must forgo any profit or management fee.

NIJ welcomes applications under which two or more entities would carry out the federal award; however, only one entity may be the applicant. Any others must be proposed as subrecipients (subgrantees)¹. The applicant must be the entity that would have primary responsibility for carrying out the award, including administering funding, managing the entire project, and monitoring and appropriately managing any subawards ("subgrants").

Under this solicitation, any particular applicant entity may submit more than one application, as long as each application proposes a different project in response to the solicitation. Also, an entity may be proposed as a subrecipient (subgrantee) in more than one application.

¹ For additional information on subawards, see "Budget and Associated Documentation" under [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#).

NIJ may elect to fund applications submitted under this FY 2018 solicitation in future fiscal years, dependent on, among other considerations, the merit of the applications and on the availability of appropriations.

Deadline

Applicants must register with Grants.gov at <https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/register.html> prior to submitting an application. All applications are due by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on May 14, 2018.

To be considered timely, an application must be submitted by the application deadline using Grants.gov, and the applicant must have received a validation message from Grants.gov that indicates successful and timely submission. OJP urges applicants to submit applications at least 72 hours prior to the application due date, to allow time for the applicant to receive validation messages or rejection notifications from Grants.gov, and to correct in a timely fashion any problems that may have caused a rejection notification.

OJP encourages all applicants to read this [Important Notice: Applying for Grants in Grants.gov](#).

For additional information, see [How to Apply](#) in [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#).

Contact Information

For technical assistance with submitting an application, contact the Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline at 800-518-4726, 606-545-5035, at <https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/support.html>, or via email to support@grants.gov. The [Grants.gov](#) Support Hotline operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, except on federal holidays.

An applicant that experiences unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond its control that prevent it from submitting its application by the deadline may email the NIJ contact identified below **within 24 hours after the application deadline** to request approval to submit its application. Additional information on reporting technical issues appears under Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues in the [How to Apply](#) section.

For assistance with any other requirements of this solicitation, contact the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) Response Center: toll-free at 1-800-851-3420; via TTY at 301-240-6310 (hearing impaired only); email grants@ncjrs.gov; fax to 301-240-5830; or web chat at <https://webcontact.ncjrs.gov/ncjchat/chat.jsp>. The NCJRS Response Center hours of operation are 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. eastern time, Monday through Friday, and 10:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. eastern time on the solicitation close date. General information on applying for NIJ awards can be found at www.nij.gov/funding/Pages/welcome.aspx. Answers to frequently asked questions that may assist applicants are posted at www.nij.gov/funding/Pages/faqs.aspx.

Grants.gov number assigned to this solicitation: NIJ-2018-14001

Release date: March 16, 2018

Contents

A. Program Description	4
Overview	4
Program-Specific Information	4
Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products	11
B. Federal Award Information.....	13
Type of Award	14
Financial Management and System of Internal Controls	14
Budget Information	15
Cost Sharing or Matching Requirement	15
Pre-agreement Costs (also known as Pre-award Costs)	15
Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver.....	16
Prior Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conference/Meeting/Training Costs	16
Costs Associated With Language Assistance (if applicable)	17
C. Eligibility Information.....	17
D. Application and Submission Information	17
What an Application Should Include	17
How to Apply	32
E. Application Review Information.....	36
Review Criteria	36
Review Process.....	38
F. Federal Award Administration Information	39
Federal Award Notices	39
Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements	40
General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements.....	41
G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)	41
H. Other Information.....	42
Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552 and 5 U.S.C. 552a)	42
Provide Feedback to OJP	42
Application Checklist	43

Research and Evaluation on the Administration of Justice

(CFDA No. 16.560)

A. Program Description

Overview

NIJ seeks applications for funding investigator-initiated, interdisciplinary research and evaluation projects related to the administration of justice in three areas: (1) eyewitness evidence; (2) front-end intervention strategies; and (3) enhancing investigations and prosecutions. This solicitation aims to strengthen the knowledge base concerning these three areas and to improve public safety by producing findings with practical implications.

Strong applications that address the administration of justice in the United States, which fall outside these three priority areas, may also be considered. This solicitation supports the U.S. Department of Justice's priorities of reducing violent crime and enhancing investigations and prosecutions.

Statutory Authority: Any awards under this solicitation would be made under statutory authority provided by a full-year appropriations act for FY 2018. As of the writing of this solicitation, the Department of Justice is operating under a short-term "Continuing Resolution"; no full-year appropriation for the Department has been enacted for FY 2018.

Program-Specific Information

1. Eyewitness Identification Evidence

Suspect misidentification is a known contributor to wrongful convictions. The "positive identification" of a suspect as the perpetrator, particularly when given by the victim of a crime, has been shown to have a significant effect on jury deliberations. Research on eyewitness memory points to several factors that can affect the accuracy and confidence of identification.² Some factors, such as the stress or trauma at the time of the crime, or visual conditions that affect visibility of a perpetrator's features, are outside the direct control of the criminal justice system (typically called estimator variables). Other factors can be more directly controlled for by criminal justice system procedures (typically called system variables). System variables occur throughout the investigation and eyewitness identification process. During the investigation process and initial identification of a suspect, procedures such as the structure and timing of witness interviews, the types of questions asked, or feedback to the witness during questioning/profile generation can affect later identification. Research on human memory has highlighted the role of stress and attention factors when viewing an event as important for later recall precision. In addition, research has shown that humans can be susceptible to recalling false details or information of a specific event as an unconscious function of how the brain links conceptually related information in memory.

² Wells, G. L., Memon, A., Penrod, S. D. (2006). Eyewitness Evidence: Improving Its Probative Value. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 7(2), 45–75.

Similarly, research on facial recognition processes indicates that there are more individual differences in people's ability to identify faces than previously thought.

With this solicitation, NIJ seeks proposals for research to harness the advances made in cognitive neuroscience to better understand the factors influencing eyewitnesses' memories of events and how estimator and systemic variables might best be accounted for to reduce the potential for misidentification. Potential research questions include, but are not limited to:

- How do attention and memory encoding conditions at the time of a crime affect subsequent eyewitness identification accuracy?
- How can different types of memory retrieval cues during the investigation process influence eyewitness recall and identification?

2. Front-end Intervention Strategies

a. Diversion and Deflection

Police diversion programs (sometimes referred to as pre-arrest, pre-booking diversion, or deflection programs) represent alternatives to traditional responses to individuals who commit low-level criminal offenses. Many of these programs are designed to reduce criminal behavior; decrease overall costs to the criminal justice system; provide solutions to enhance public safety; and strengthen relationships between the police and community residents.

Prosecutor-led diversion programs offer similar responses to criminal behavior by giving prosecutors effective tools to allocate resources through the implementation of pretrial diversion strategies. These programs include various treatment components to promote positive changes in criminal offender behavior; improve confidence in the criminal justice system; and maintain public safety. Diversion and deflection programs are designed to steer certain offenders away from different stages in the criminal justice system by addressing their substance abuse or mental health challenges with resources such as community-based or in-patient treatment interventions. In recent years, a number of such programs have been adopted and although the potential of these programs has been noted, additional rigorous assessments of these interventions are needed.³ NIJ is interested in evaluations of diversion or deflection programs with research questions that may include but are not limited to:

- What is the impact of deflection or diversion programs on crime and/or drug abuse?
- What is the impact of diversion or deflection programs on cost to taxpayers and/or the criminal justice system?
- What barriers inhibit the potential success, if any, of diversion or deflection programs?
- What is the impact of diversion or deflection programs on police-community relationships?

³A National Survey of Criminal Justice Diversion Programs and Initiatives.

b. Pretrial Notification Protocols and Court Appearance Compliance

NIJ sponsors criminal court research and court-based program evaluation to identify tools, programs and policies that satisfy criminal justice system goals including public safety, cost efficiency, and fair and equitable treatment of victims and defendants. Proposals submitted for funding consideration should build upon this portfolio in the area of notification protocols to improve court appearance rates for increased efficiency in case processing and delivery of justice. Pretrial research and practice experts identify court appearances and failure to appear (FTA) as a primary concern. In FY 2008, an NIJ-funded field experiment tested the impact of various notices on perceived procedural justice and court appearance compliance. The researchers examined variation in FTA at misdemeanor arraignment by experimenting with different written notification and messages. They found that any reminder was better than none (especially among defendants who lack trust in the criminal justice system), and a reminder with substantive information was better, but emphasis on procedural justice is no more effective than an FTA sanctions message alone.⁴

Effectiveness in promoting court appearance compliance can vary by case or defendant population, and proposals should address the various challenges courts experience in implementing pretrial notification protocols. Cases differ in type and severity, whereby some were issued a citation and are notified to confirm the scheduling of their first court appearance. Others are arrested and booked on misdemeanor or felony offenses and released until arraignment or the next court hearing. Defendant housing stability, local family networks, mobile phone access, and other resources are also relevant. Furthermore, jurisdictions vary in staffing and other resources necessary to implement manual or automated systems, and maintain current information on defendant contacts and court case status.

NIJ seeks proposals for research on innovative pretrial notification models that leverage agency time and capacity with protocols that reduce FTAs, thus promoting defendant accountability and efficient use of court resources. Research questions of interest include but are not limited to:

- What pretrial notification protocols are most effective in reducing FTAs?
- What case and/or defendant characteristics mediate or moderate the effects of notification protocols?
- Are pretrial notification protocols cost-efficient?
- How can pretrial notification protocols be improved to be more cost-efficient?

c. Bail Reform

States and other jurisdictions vary widely in pretrial policy and practice. As of 2014, the National Association of Pretrial Services Agencies estimated about 450 programs in the

⁴ See Bornstein, B.H., Tomkins, A.J., Neeley, E.M., Herian, M.N., & Hamm, J.A. (2013). Reducing courts' failure-to-appear rate by written requirements. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 19(1), 70-80; and Bornstein, B.H., Tomkins, A.J., & Neeley, E.M. (2011). Reducing courts' failure to appear rate: A procedural justice approach. NCJ 234370, Washington, DC: United States Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

3,300 counties and the 95 federal districts of the U.S. New York City's Criminal Justice Agency and others initially developed standard protocols for pretrial assessment and release recommendations that were operational by the 1980s. Assessments were based on criminal history, self-report, and verified community ties (employment, housing) that were predictive of court appearances, with some legal variable overrides (e.g., homicides). Pretrial release and detention policies and practices of interest include: risk assessment, public safety, court appearances (failure to appear or FTA), community supervision, and related issues (e.g., serious mental illness).⁵ NIJ is interested in policy analysis and other research on more recent developments concerning bail reform legislation. States are considering legislation to shift from relying principally on monetary bail as a condition of release to individualized assessments based on a defendant's flight risk and potential threat to public safety. The goals include reducing costs associated with pretrial jail detention, which may interfere with defendant employment and family responsibilities, and reserving money bail as a last resort. Reviews of the protocols and assessment tools used to implement these pretrial reform initiatives are still underway.

NIJ seeks proposals for research on the implementation, effects, and costs of bail reform. Research questions of interest include but are not limited to:

1. What assessment factors best determine eligibility for pretrial release versus detention in predicting outcomes including:
 - a) Failure to appear.
 - b) Violation of pretrial release conditions.
 - c) New criminal offenses.
2. Are pretrial release decisions made according to assessment results, and what factors are used to override assessment results?
3. Are there any changes in the number of type of defendants released on their own recognizance versus monetary bail?
4. Under what conditions are pretrial defendants released, and does community-based supervision affect outcomes?
5. How do the implementation and outcome costs associated with assessment and other bail reform measures compare to business as usual?

⁵ See Pretrial Research Meeting at <https://www.nij.gov/topics/courts/pretrial/Pages/research-meeting.aspx>.

d. Justice System-Led Strategies⁶ Aimed at Young-Adult⁷ Offenders

Despite comprising less than 10 percent of the U.S. population, young adults (18-24) comprise 28 percent of arrests, 26 percent of probationers, 12 percent of the prison population, and 28 percent of the jail population.⁸ Further, after release, nearly half of young adults return to prison within three years.⁹ The recidivism trends suggest that the current criminal justice response is not sufficient. Having a criminal justice system that appropriately responds to criminal behavior of young adults has the potential to increase public safety and reduce future violent criminal activity, resulting in safer communities.

NIJ commissioned an [environmental scan](#) of programs and legislation across the nation that target this population. The scan revealed over 50 programs, strategies and approaches, and eight pieces of legislation. Because this is an emerging area, the scan highlighted research gaps and showed the dearth of evaluation evidence for these programs.

With this solicitation, NIJ seeks to address that dearth of evidence by funding proposals for evaluations of justice system-led programs or strategies aimed at young-adult offenders. Applicants should propose the most rigorous research design possible. Research questions may include, but are not limited to:

- What is the impact of young-adult courts on reducing subsequent offending?
- What is the impact of other justice system-led strategies aimed at young adults (e.g., special prosecution units, pretrial programs, front-end interventions) on reducing subsequent offending?
- What are the costs and benefits associated with justice system-led programs or strategies that respond to crimes committed by young adults?

3. Enhancing Investigations and Prosecutions

a. Body-Worn Cameras

In a sample of law enforcement agencies by the Major Cities Chiefs Association and Major County Sheriffs' Association, 95 percent of all police departments have a fully operational Body-Worn Camera program, or are committed to implementing one.¹⁰ The broad adoption and implementation of this technology has implications for prosecutors and the courts.

⁶ Justice system-led strategies refer to the range of strategies identified in NIJ's *Environmental Scan of Developmentally Appropriate Criminal Justice Responses to Justice-Involved Young Adults* that are either young adult courts or fall under the auspices of the district attorney's office or the probation department. <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/249902.pdf>.

⁷ *Young adult* commonly refers to individuals ages 18-24; however, these bounds are flexible. Applicants proposing an age range outside 18-24 should justify their decision to use an age range that includes those under the age of 18 or those over the age of 24.

⁸ See Justice Policy Institute, *Improving Approaches to Serving Young Adults in the Justice System*. December 2016.

⁹ Matthew R. Durose, Alexia D. Cooper, and Howard N. Snyder, *Recidivism of Prisoners Released in 30 States in 2005: Patterns from 2005 to 2010*, U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics (2014).

¹⁰ Charles DeWitt, "Survey of Technology Needs: Body-Worn Cameras," *Body-Worn Cameras: Building a Secure and Manageable Program for Law Enforcement*, January 21, 2016.

To date, there has been limited research on the effect of body-worn cameras on criminal prosecutions or prosecution outcomes. Prior research has found that while prosecutors believe that evidence from Body-Worn Cameras would increase their preparation time, they also believe that it would improve their overall ability to prosecute cases.¹¹ Prosecutors also believe that convictions and plea bargains would increase due to evidence resulting from this technology and that the use of body-worn camera evidence would not lead to an increase in dismissals or appeals.¹² In 2014, researchers found that in domestic violence cases, prosecutors were more likely to file charges when body-worn camera video was available.¹³ While these studies are encouraging, much research is still needed.

With this solicitation, NIJ seeks proposals for research and/or evaluation projects to grow the body of knowledge concerning the effect of body-worn cameras on criminal prosecutions or prosecution outcomes. Specific research questions may include, but are not limited to the following:

- How is information derived from body-worn cameras used by prosecutors for charging and prosecuting of criminal cases in court?
- How is the strength of body-worn camera evidence assessed by prosecutors, and how does that affect their decision-making and case outcomes?
- How do issues such as video redaction and segmentation of video affect evidentiary concerns regarding authenticity, best evidence, and reliability?

b. Research on Juror Decision-Making

Juries have a responsibility in court cases to render verdicts that are fair and based on the evidence presented by the prosecution and the defense, as well as jury instructions provided by judges. There are a number of factors at play when jurors analyze evidence and interpret jury instructions, including heuristic cognitive biases jurors use when evaluating the probative value of complex evidence, the influence of personal characteristics of the parties in the case, and/or emotions evoked during testimony that influence later consideration of the facts of the case.¹⁴ With this solicitation, NIJ seeks proposals for research and/or evaluation projects that explore juror decision-making and the process by which consensus is achieved, to inform court processes and trial strategies. Specific research questions may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Do juror questionnaires accurately detect relevant bias, and what is the role of bias in juror decision-making?
- Do jurors/juries evaluate types of evidence differently?

¹¹ Linda Merola et al., *Body-Worn Cameras and the Courts: A National Survey of State Prosecutors*, Report for the Laura and John Arnold Foundation (Fairfax, VA/USA: George Mason University, 2016), 27.

¹² *Ibid.*, 29-30.

¹³ Charles M. Katz et al., *Evaluating the Impact of Officer Worn Body Cameras in the Phoenix Police Department* (Tempe, AZ/USA: Center for Violence Prevention & Community Safety, Arizona State University, 2014), 37.

¹⁴ Bornstein, B. H., & Greene, E. (2011). Jury decision making: Implications for and from psychology. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20(1), 63-67.

- To what extent do jurors comprehend judicial instructions, and how, if at all, does that level of comprehension impact decision-making?
- What leads jurors/juries to consider extralegal factors during trial?
- How do juror/jury perceptions of fairness of the legal offence being prosecuted influence their decision?
- How does a jury generally come to a consensus decision?

Additional Guidance Applicable to All Research Categories

Randomized controlled trial (RCT) studies are a powerful, much needed tool for building scientific evidence about what works. Therefore, studies employing RCT methods to assess the effectiveness of programs and practices will be given higher priority consideration. RCT applications with strong designs measuring outcomes of self-evident policy importance are strongly encouraged. A strong RCT design should include low sample attrition, sufficient sample size, close adherence to random assignment, valid outcome measures, and statistical analyses. Taking RCT costs into consideration, applicants may want to consider studies using privacy-protected administrative data that are already being collected or implementing an intervention into a program already funded.

- NIJ is especially interested in supporting research relevant to small, rural, and tribal jurisdictions.
- Applications must demonstrate cultural competence by addressing regional, racial/ethnic, language, and other diversity issues in proposed research protocol and team capabilities, as applicable.
- Each partnering agency must provide a letter of commitment clarifying information, staff, and other resources.
- Each research team member (staff, contractor, consultant, agency partner, etc.) must be identified with a clearly specified role and projected level of effort, regardless of compensation.
- Any potential conflict of interest must be addressed if any research team member may benefit financially from, or is/was involved in the development of, what is being researched. (Also see Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity.)
- The research proposed must result in knowledge and tools that have potential value to other jurisdictions for a national impact.
- Applications for research that leverage projects actively supported by federal, private, or other entities must clarify the proposed value added, how information collected and other resources funded by NIJ will remain separate, and plans for dissemination including public archive of work products.

New Investigator/Early Career Opportunity

NIJ is interested in supporting researchers who are early in their careers and new to NIJ's research grant portfolios, specifically non-tenured assistant professors, or equivalent full-time staff scientist positions in a research institution, who propose research on topics relevant to NIJ's Office of Research and Evaluation (ORE) and/or Office of Science and Technology (OST). To that end, NIJ may, in appropriate circumstances, give special consideration in award decisions to applications proposing such researchers as principal investigators (PIs). To qualify, the proposed PI must at the time of application submission:

- Hold a non-tenured assistant professor appointment at an accredited institution of higher education in the United States or an equivalent full-time staff scientist position at a research institution; and
- Have completed a terminal degree or post-graduate clinical training within the ten (10) years prior to September 30, 2018, and
- Have never previously received NIJ funding as a PI on a research project with the exception of Graduate Research Fellows or Data Resources Program grantees.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] If seeking to be considered for the New Investigator/Early Career Opportunity, the applicant should identify that they are submitting a New Investigator/Early Career proposal on the title page of the application.

Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products

The goal of this solicitation is to strengthen NIJ's knowledge base by producing findings with practical implications for enhancing criminal justice processes. The objective of this solicitation is to fund research and evaluation projects that employ high-quality, rigorous, social science methods and produce results with practical implications for reducing crime; enhancing investigations and prosecutions; and, promoting public safety.

Final Research Report. Any recipient of an award under this solicitation will be expected to submit a final research report. Additional information on the final research report requirement for the solicitation is posted on the [Post Award Reporting Requirements Page](#) on NIJ's website.

Required Data Sets and Associated Files and Documentation. Any recipient of an award under this solicitation will be expected to submit to the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data (NACJD) all relevant data sets that result in whole or in part from the work funded by the award, along with associated files and any documentation necessary for future efforts by others to reproduce the project's findings and/or to extend the scientific value of the data set through secondary analysis. For more information, see Program Narrative in [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#).

In addition to these deliverables (and the required reports and data on performance measures described in [Section F. Federal Award Administration Information](#)), NIJ expects scholarly products to result from each award under this solicitation, taking the form of one or more published, peer-reviewed, scientific journal articles, and/or (if appropriate) law review journal

articles, book chapter(s) or book(s) in the academic press, technological prototypes, patented inventions, or similar scientific products.

The Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products are directly related to the performance measures that demonstrate the results of the work completed.

Performance Measures

OJP will require each successful applicant to submit regular performance data that demonstrate the results of the work carried out under the award (see “[General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements](#)” in [Section F. Federal Award Administration Information](#)).

Applicants should visit OJP’s performance measurement page at www.ojp.gov/performance to view the specific reporting requirements for this grant program.

The application should demonstrate the applicant’s understanding of the performance data reporting requirements for this grant program and detail how the applicant will gather the required data should it receive funding.

Please note that applicants are **not** required to submit performance data with the application. Performance measures information is included as an alert that successful applicants will be required to submit performance data as part of the reporting requirements under an award.

Objective	Performance Measure(s)	Data Recipient Provides
<p>Conduct research in science, technology, engineering, and/or mathematics having clear implications for criminal justice policy and practice in the United States.</p> <p>Conduct research in social and behavioral sciences having clear implications for criminal justice policy and practice in the United States.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Relevance to the needs of the field as measured by whether the project’s substantive scope did not deviate from the funded project or any subsequent agency-approved modifications to the scope. 2. Quality of the research as demonstrated by the scholarly products that result in whole or in part from work funded under the NIJ award, such as published, peer-reviewed, scientific journal articles, and/or (as appropriate for the funded project) law review journal articles, book chapter(s) or book(s) in the academic press, technological prototypes, patented inventions, or similar scientific products. 3. Quality of management as measured by such factors as whether significant project milestones were achieved, reporting and other deadlines were met, and costs remained within approved limits. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quarterly financial reports, semi-annual and final progress reports, and products of the work performed under the NIJ award (including, at minimum, a final research report). If applicable, an annual audit report. 2. List of citation(s) to all scholarly products that resulted in whole or in part from work funded under the NIJ award. 3. If applicable, each data set that resulted in whole or in part from work funded under the NIJ award.

Evaluation Research

If an application includes an evaluation research component (or consists entirely of evaluation research), the application is expected to propose the most rigorous evaluation design appropriate for the research questions to be addressed. If the primary purpose of the evaluation is to determine the effectiveness or impact of an intervention (e.g., program, practice, or policy), the most rigorous evaluation designs may include random selection and assignment of participants (or other appropriate units of analysis) to experimental and control conditions. In cases where randomization is not feasible, applicants should propose a strong quasi-experimental design that can address the risk of selection bias.

Applications that include evaluation research should consider the feasibility of including cost/benefit analysis. In cases where evaluations find that interventions have produced the intended benefit, cost/benefit analysis provides valuable and practical information for practitioners and policymakers that aids decision-making.

Evaluation research projects may also address a wide range of research questions beyond those focused on the effectiveness or impact of an intervention. Different research designs may be more appropriate for different research questions and at different stages of program development. The intervention strategies, setting, other contextual factors, and resources should be taken into account when selecting an evaluation design. In all cases, applications are expected to propose the most rigorous evaluation design appropriate for the research questions to be addressed.

Applicants are encouraged to review evidence rating criteria at https://www.crimesolutions.gov/about_starttofinish.aspx for further information on high-quality evaluation design elements.

B. Federal Award Information

NIJ expects to make multiple awards with an estimated total amount awarded of up to \$3 million. Of the \$3 million proposed for this solicitation, NIJ expects that up to \$500,000 will be available for relevant research in Indian Country. *Awards will normally not exceed a three-year period of performance.*

An applicant should base its federal funding request and period of performance on the actual requirements of the research, and not necessarily on the anticipated amount of funding available in FY 2018 for awards under this solicitation nor to fit within a three-year period of performance. However, to expedite the budget approval process, applicants are encouraged to break out their budgets by project year or by phases in the event that NIJ chooses to fund the project partially or incrementally.

To allow time for (among other things) any necessary post-award review and financial clearance by OJP of the proposed budget and for any associated responses or other action(s) that may be required of the recipient, applicants should propose an award start date of January 1, 2019.

If the applicant is proposing a project that reasonably could be conducted in discrete phases, with each phase resulting in completion of one or more significant, defined milestones, then NIJ strongly recommends that the applicant structure the application—specifically including the narrative, expected scholarly products, timelines/milestones, and budget detail worksheet and

budget narrative—to clearly define each phase. (This is particularly the case if the applicant proposes a project that will exceed—in cost or the length of the period of performance—the amount or length of time anticipated for an individual award (or awards) under this solicitation.) Given limitations on the availability to NIJ of funds for awards for research, development, and evaluation, this information will assist NIJ in considering whether partial funding of applications would be productive. (If, in FY 2018, NIJ elects to fund only certain phases of a proposed project, the expected scholarly products from the partial-funding award may, in some cases, vary from those described above.)

NIJ may, in certain cases, provide additional funding in future years to awards made under its research, development, and evaluation solicitations, through continuation awards. In making decisions regarding continuation awards, OJP will consider, among other factors, the availability of appropriations, when the program or project was last competed, OJP's strategic priorities, and OJP's assessment of both the management of the award (for example, timeliness and quality of progress reports), and the progress of the work funded under the award.

All awards are subject to the availability of appropriated funds and to any modifications or additional requirements that may be imposed by law.

Type of Award

NIJ expects that any award under this solicitation will be made in the form of a grant or cooperative agreement. A cooperative agreement is a particular type of award that provides for OJP to have substantial involvement in carrying out award activities. See [Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements](#), under [Section F. Federal Award Administration Information](#), for a brief discussion of what may constitute substantial federal involvement. As discussed [later in the solicitation](#), important rules (including limitations) apply to any conference/meeting/training costs under cooperative agreements.

Please note: Any recipient of an award under this solicitation will be required to comply with DOJ regulations on confidentiality and protection of human subjects. See “Requirements related to Research” under [“Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2018 Awards”](#) in the OJP Funding Resource Center at <https://ojp.gov/funding/index.htm>.

Financial Management and System of Internal Controls

Award recipients and subrecipients (including recipients or subrecipients that are pass-through entities¹⁵) must, as described in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements¹⁶ as set out at 2 C.F.R. 200.303:

- (a) Establish and maintain effective internal control over the Federal award that provides reasonable assurance that [the recipient (and any subrecipient)] is managing the Federal award in compliance with Federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the Federal award. These internal controls should be in compliance with guidance in “Standards for Internal Control in the

¹⁵ For purposes of this solicitation, the phrase “pass-through entity” includes any recipient or subrecipient that provides a subaward (“subgrant”) to carry out part of the funded award or program.

¹⁶ The “Part 200 Uniform Requirements” means the DOJ regulation at 2 C.F.R. Part 2800, which adopts (with certain modifications) the provisions of 2 C.F.R. Part 200.

Federal Government” issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and the “Internal Control Integrated Framework”, issued by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (COSO).

- (b) Comply with Federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the Federal awards.
- (c) Evaluate and monitor [the recipient’s (and any subrecipient’s)] compliance with statutes, regulations and the terms and conditions of Federal awards.
- (d) Take prompt action when instances of noncompliance are identified including noncompliance identified in audit findings.
- (e) Take reasonable measures to safeguard protected personally identifiable information and other information the Federal awarding agency or pass-through entity designates as sensitive or [the recipient (or any subrecipient)] considers sensitive consistent with applicable Federal, state, local, and tribal laws regarding privacy and obligations of confidentiality.

To help ensure that applicants understand applicable administrative requirements and cost principles, OJP encourages prospective applicants to enroll, at no charge, in the DOJ Grants Financial Management Online Training, available at <https://ojpfgm.webfirst.com/>. (This training is required for all OJP recipients.)

Also, applicants should be aware that OJP collects information from applicants on their financial management and systems of internal controls (among other information) which is used to make award decisions. Under [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#), applicants may access and review the OJP Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire (<https://ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/FinancialCapability.pdf>) that OJP requires **all** applicants (other than an individual applying in his/her personal capacity) to download, complete, and submit as part of the application.”

Budget Information

What will not be funded:

- Applications primarily to purchase equipment, materials, or supplies. (A budget may include these items if they are necessary to conduct research, development, demonstration, evaluation, or analysis.)
- Applications that are not responsive to this specific solicitation.

Cost Sharing or Matching Requirement

See “Cofunding” paragraph under item 4 (“Budget and Associated Documentation”) under [What an Application Should Include](#) in [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#).

Pre-agreement Costs (also known as Pre-award Costs)

Pre-agreement costs are costs incurred by the applicant prior to the start date of the period of performance of the federal award.

OJP does **not** typically approve pre-agreement costs; an applicant must request and obtain the prior written approval of OJP for all such costs. All such costs incurred prior to award and prior to approval of the costs are incurred at the sole risk of the applicant. (Generally, no applicant should incur project costs *before* submitting an application requesting federal funding for those costs.) Should there be extenuating circumstances that make it appropriate for OJP to consider approving pre-agreement costs, the applicant may contact the point of contact listed on the title page of this solicitation for the requirements concerning written requests for approval. If approved in advance by OJP, award funds may be used for pre-agreement costs, consistent with the recipient's approved budget and applicable cost principles. See the section on "Costs Requiring Prior Approval" in the DOJ Grants Financial Guide at <https://ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/index.htm> for more information.

Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver

With respect to any award of more than \$250,000 made under this solicitation, a recipient may not use federal funds to pay total cash compensation (salary plus cash bonuses) to any employee of the recipient at a rate that exceeds 110 percent of the maximum annual salary payable to a member of the Federal Government's Senior Executive Service (SES) at an agency with a Certified SES Performance Appraisal System for that year.¹⁷ The 2018 salary table for SES employees is available at the Office of Personnel Management website at <https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/pay-leave/salaries-wages/salary-tables/18Tables/exec/html/ES.aspx>. Note: A recipient may compensate an employee at a greater rate, provided the amount in excess of this compensation limitation is paid with non-federal funds. (Non-federal funds used for any such additional compensation will not be considered matching funds, where match requirements apply.) If only a portion of an employee's time is charged to an OJP award, the maximum allowable compensation is equal to the percentage of time worked times the maximum salary limitation.

The Director of the National Institute of Justice may exercise discretion to waive, on an individual basis, this limitation on compensation rates allowable under an award. An applicant that requests a waiver should include a detailed justification in the budget narrative of its application. An applicant that does not submit a waiver request and justification with its application should anticipate that OJP will require the applicant to adjust and resubmit the budget.

The justification should address, in the context of the work the individual would do under the award, the particular qualifications and expertise of the individual, the uniqueness of a service the individual will provide, the individual's specific knowledge of the proposed program or project, and a statement that explains whether and how the individual's salary under the award would be commensurate with the regular and customary rate for an individual with his/her qualifications and expertise, and for the work he/she would do under the award.

Prior Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conference/Meeting/Training Costs

OJP strongly encourages every applicant that proposes to use award funds for any conference-, meeting-, or training-related activity (or similar event) to review carefully—before submitting an application—the OJP policy and guidance on approval, planning, and reporting of such events,

¹⁷ OJP does not apply this limitation on the use of award funds to the nonprofit organizations listed in Appendix VIII to 2 C.F.R. Part 200.

available at www.ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/PostawardRequirements/chapter3.10a.htm. OJP policy and guidance (1) encourage minimization of conference, meeting, and training costs; (2) require prior written approval (which may affect project timelines) of most conference, meeting, and training costs for cooperative agreement recipients and of some conference, meeting, and training costs for grant recipients; and (3) set cost limits, which include a general prohibition of all food and beverage costs.

Costs Associated With Language Assistance (if applicable)

If an applicant proposes a program or activity that would deliver services or benefits to individuals, the costs of taking reasonable steps to provide meaningful access to those services or benefits for individuals with limited English proficiency may be allowable. Reasonable steps to provide meaningful access to services or benefits may include interpretation or translation services, where appropriate.

For additional information, see the "Civil Rights Compliance" section under "[Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2018 Awards](#)" in the OJP Funding Resource Center at <https://ojp.gov/funding/index.htm>.

C. Eligibility Information

For eligibility information, see title page.

For information on cost sharing or match requirements, see "[What an Application Should Include](#)" in [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#).

D. Application and Submission Information

What an Application Should Include

This section describes in detail what an application should include. An applicant should anticipate that if it fails to submit an application that contains all of the specified elements, it may negatively affect the review of its application; and, should a decision be made to make an award, it may result in the inclusion of award conditions that preclude the recipient from accessing or using award funds until the recipient satisfies the conditions and OJP makes the funds available.

Moreover, an applicant should anticipate that an application that OJP determines is nonresponsive to the scope of the solicitation, or that OJP determines does not include the application elements that NIJ has designated to be critical, will neither proceed to peer review nor receive further consideration. For this solicitation, NIJ has designated the following application elements as critical: Program Narrative, Budget Detail Worksheet, Budget Narrative, and resumes/curriculum vitae of key personnel. (For purposes of this solicitation, "key personnel" means the principal investigator, and any and all co-principal investigators.)

NOTE: OJP has combined the Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative in a single document collectively referred to as the Budget Detail Worksheet. See "Budget Information and Associated Documentation" below for more information about the Budget Detail Worksheet and where it can be accessed.

OJP strongly recommends that applicants use appropriately descriptive file names (e.g., “Program Narrative,” “Budget Detail Worksheet,” “Timelines,” “Memoranda of Understanding,” “Resumes”) for all attachments. Also, OJP recommends that applicants include resumes in a single file.

Please review the “Note on File Names and File Types” under [How to Apply](#) to be sure applications are submitted in permitted formats.

1. Information to Complete the Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424)

The SF-424 is a required standard form used as a cover sheet for submission of pre-applications, applications, and related information. Grants.gov and OJP’s Grants Management System (GMS) take information from the applicant’s profile to populate the fields on this form. When selecting “type of applicant,” if the applicant is a for-profit entity, select “For-Profit Organization” or “Small Business” (as applicable).

To avoid processing delays, an applicant must include an accurate legal name on its SF-424. On the SF-424, current OJP award recipients, when completing the field for “Legal Name” (box 8a), should use the same legal name that appears on the prior year award document (which is also the legal name stored in OJP’s financial system.) Also, these recipients should enter the Employer Identification Number (EIN) in box 8b exactly as it appears on the prior year award document. An applicant with a current, active award(s) must ensure that its GMS profile is current. If the profile is not current, the applicant should submit a Grant Adjustment Notice updating the information on its GMS profile prior to applying under this solicitation.

A new applicant entity should enter its official legal name in box 8a, its address in box 8d, its EIN in box 8b, and its Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number in box 8c of the SF-424. A new applicant entity should attach official legal documents to their applications (e.g., articles of incorporation, 501(c)(3) status documentation, organizational letterhead etc.) to confirm the legal name, address, and EIN entered into the SF-424. OJP will use the System for Award Management (SAM) to confirm the legal name and DUNS number entered in the SF-424; therefore, an applicant should ensure that the information entered in the SF-424 matches its current registration in SAM. See the [How to Apply](#) section for more information on SAM and DUNS numbers.

Intergovernmental Review: This solicitation (“funding opportunity”) **is not** subject to [Executive Order 12372](#). (In completing the SF-424, an applicant is to answer question 19 by selecting the response that the “Program is not covered by E.O. 12372.”)

2. Project Abstract

The project abstract is a very important part of the application, and serves as an introduction to the proposed project. NIJ uses the project abstract for a number of purposes, including assignment of the application to an appropriate review panel. If the application is funded, the project abstract typically will become public information and be used to describe the project.

Applications should include a high-quality project abstract that summarizes the proposed project in 250-400 words. Project abstracts not submitted in the template below should be—

- Written for a general public audience.
- Submitted as a separate attachment with “Project Abstract” as part of its file name.
- Single-spaced, using the form’s standard 12-point font (with 1-inch margins).

As a separate attachment, the project abstract will **not** count against the page limit for the program narrative.

Project abstracts should follow the detailed template (including the detailed instructions as to content) available at www.nij.gov/funding/documents/nij-project-abstract-template.pdf.

3. Program Narrative

The program narrative section of the application should not exceed 30 double-spaced pages in 12-point font with 1-inch margins. If included in the main body of the program narrative, tables, charts, figures, and other illustrations count toward the 30-page limit for the narrative section. The project abstract, table of contents, appendices, and government forms do not count toward the 30-page limit.

If the program narrative fails to comply with these length-related restrictions, NIJ may consider such noncompliance in peer review and in final award decisions.

The following sections should be included as part of the program narrative.¹⁸

Program Narrative Guidelines:

a. Title Page (not counted against the 30-page program narrative limit).

The title page should include the title of the project, submission date, funding opportunity number, and the name and complete contact information (that is, address, telephone number, and e-mail address) for both the applicant and the principal investigator.

b. Resubmit Response (if applicable) (not counted against the 30-page program narrative limit).

If an applicant is resubmitting an application presented previously to NIJ, but not funded, the applicant should indicate this. A statement should be provided, no more than two pages, addressing: (1) the title, submission date, and NIJ-assigned application number of the previous application, and (2) a brief summary of revisions to the application, including responses to previous feedback received from NIJ.

¹⁸ As noted earlier, if the proposed program or project reasonably could be conducted in discrete phases, with each phase resulting in completion of one or more significant, defined milestones, then NIJ strongly recommends that the applicant structure the application – specifically including the narrative, expected scholarly products, timelines/milestones, and budget detail worksheet and budget narrative – to set out each phase clearly. (In appropriate cases, the expected scholarly product(s) from a particular phase may vary from those described above.) See generally “Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products” under “Program-Specific Information,” above.

c. Table of Contents and Figures (not counted against the 30-page program narrative limit).

d. Main Body

The main body of the program narrative should describe the proposed project in depth. The following sections should be included as part of the program narrative:

- **Statement of the Problem and Research Questions.** The statement of the problem should address the need for research in this area. Applicants should discuss current gaps in data, research, and knowledge, including those for particular justice sectors, for certain populations, and to answer questions relevant to current policy and practice needs and public interests. As part of this discussion, applicants should present a review of previous literature and discuss previous research related to these problems.

This section should also identify the proposed research questions and discuss the purpose, goals, and objectives of the proposed project.

- **Project Design and Implementation.** Applicants should provide a detailed description of the strategies to implement this research project and address the research questions. Design elements should follow directly from the research project's goals and objectives and address the program-specific information noted on page 4. Applicants should describe the research methodology in detail and demonstrate the validity and usefulness of the data they will collect. Applicants should consider the rigor and soundness of the methodology and analytical and technical approaches for the proposed research and address the feasibility of the proposed project and potential challenges or problems in carrying out the activities.
- **Potential Impact.** Applicants should describe the potential impact of the research and how it may inform or improve criminal or juvenile justice-related policy, practice, or theory in the United States.

The discussion of impact should include a discussion of the deliverables, including planned scholarly products indicated in the project-specific information on page 11, and a plan for dissemination to appropriate audiences. Applicants should identify plans to produce or make available to broader interested practitioners and policy makers in a form that is designed to be readily accessible and useful to them.

- **Capabilities/Competencies.** This section should describe the experience and capability of the applicant organization, key staff, and any proposed subgrantees (including consultants) that the applicant will use to implement and manage this effort and the federal funds under this award, highlighting any previous experience implementing projects of similar scope, design, and magnitude. Applicants should address:

- Experience and capacity to work with the proposed data sources in the conduct of similar research efforts.
- Experience and capacity to design and implement rigorous research and data analysis projects.
- Experience producing and disseminating meaningful deliverables.

Applicants should also outline the management plan and organization that connects to the goals and objectives of the project.

e. Appendices (not counted against the 30-page program narrative limit) include:

- Bibliography/references.
- Any tools/instruments, questionnaires, tables/charts/graphs, or maps pertaining to the proposed project that are supplemental to such items included in the main body of the narrative.
- Curriculum vitae or resume of the principal investigator and any and all co-principal investigators. In addition, curriculum vitae, resume, or biographical sketches of all other individuals (regardless of “investigator” status) who will be significantly involved in substantive aspects of the proposed project (including, for example, individuals such as statisticians used to conduct proposed data analysis).
- To assist OJP in assessing actual or apparent conflicts of interest (including such conflicts on the part of prospective reviewers of the application), a complete list of the individuals named or otherwise identified anywhere in the application (including in the budget or in any other attachment) who will or may work (or advise or consult) on the proposed research, development, or evaluation project. This applies to all such individuals, including, for example, individuals who are or would be employees of the applicant or employees of any proposed subrecipient entity, any individuals who themselves may be a subrecipient, and individuals who may (or will) work without compensation (such as advisory board members). This appendix to the program narrative is to include, for each listed individual: name, title, employer, any other potentially-pertinent organizational affiliation(s), and the individual's proposed roles and responsibilities in carrying out the proposed project. If the application identifies any specific entities or organizations (other than the applicant) that will or may work (or advise or consult) on the proposed project, without also naming any associated individuals, the name of each such organization also should be included on this list. Applicants should use the “Proposed Project Staff, Affiliation, and Roles” form available at <https://www.nij.gov/funding/documents/nij-project-staff-template.xlsx> to provide this list.

If the application (including the budget) identifies any proposed non-competitive agreements that are or may be considered procurement "contracts" (rather than subawards) for purposes of federal grants

administrative requirements the applicant also must list the entities with which the applicant proposes to contract. Applicants should provide this list as a separate sheet entitled "Proposed non-competitive procurement contracts."

For information on distinctions -- for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements -- between subawards and procurement contracts under awards, see "Budget and Associated Documentation," below.

- Proposed project timeline and expected milestones.
- Human Subjects Protection paperwork (documentation and forms related to Institutional Review Board (IRB) review). (See [nij.gov/funding/humansubjects/Pages/welcome.aspx](https://www.nij.gov/funding/humansubjects/Pages/welcome.aspx)) **Note:** Final IRB approval is not required at the time an application is submitted.
- Privacy Certificate (for further guidance go to [nij.gov/funding/humansubjects/pages/confidentiality.aspx](https://www.nij.gov/funding/humansubjects/pages/confidentiality.aspx)).
- List of any previous and current NIJ awards to the applicant and investigator(s), including the NIJ-assigned award numbers and a brief description of any scholarly products that resulted in whole or in part from work funded under the NIJ award(s). (See "Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products" under "Program-Specific Information," above, for definition of "scholarly products.")
- List of other agencies, organizations, or funding sources to which this application has been submitted (if applicable).
- Applicants proposing to use incentives or stipends payments as part of their research project design, must submit an incentive or stipend approval request, as a separate document, according to the requirements set forth at <https://www.nij.gov/funding/Pages/research-participant-costs-and-incentives.aspx>.
- Data archiving plan. Applicants should anticipate that NIJ will require (through special award conditions, that relevant data sets resulting in whole or in part from projects funded under this solicitation be submitted for archiving with the NACJD. See www.nij.gov/funding/data-resources-program/applying/Pages/data-archiving-strategies.aspx.)

Applications should include as an appendix a brief plan – labeled "Data Archiving Plan" – to comply with data archiving requirements. The plan should provide brief details about proposed data management and archiving, including submission to NIJ (through NACJD) of **all files and documentation** necessary to allow for future efforts by others to reproduce the project's findings and/or to extend the scientific value of the data set through secondary analysis. Pertinent files and documentation include, among other things, qualitative and quantitative data produced, instrumentation and data collection forms, codebook(s), any specialized programming code necessary to reproduce all constructed measures and the original data analysis,

description of necessary de-identification procedures, and (when required) a copy of the privacy certificate and informed consent protocols.

The plan should be one or two pages in length and include the level of effort associated with meeting archiving requirements.

Note that required data sets are to be submitted 90 days before the end of the period of performance.

- Letters of cooperation/support or administrative agreements from organizations collaborating in the project, such as law enforcement and correctional agencies (if applicable)

4. Budget and Associated Documentation

The Budget Detail Worksheet and the Budget Narrative are now combined in a single document collectively referred to as the Budget Detail Worksheet. The Budget Detail Worksheet is a user-friendly, fillable, Microsoft Excel-based document designed to calculate totals. Additionally, the Excel workbook contains worksheets for multiple budget years that can be completed as necessary. **All applicants should use the Excel version when completing the proposed budget in an application, except in cases where the applicant does not have access to Microsoft Excel or experiences technical difficulties.** If an applicant does not have access to Microsoft Excel or experiences technical difficulties with the Excel version, then the applicant should use the 508-compliant accessible Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) version.

Both versions of the Budget Detail Worksheet can be accessed at <https://ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Forms/BudgetDetailWorksheet.htm>.

a. Budget Detail Worksheet

The Budget Detail Worksheet should provide the detailed computation for each budget line item, listing the total cost of each and showing how it was calculated by the applicant. For example, costs for personnel should show the annual salary rate and the percentage of time devoted to the project for each employee paid with grant funds. The Budget Detail Worksheet should present a complete itemization of all proposed costs.

For questions pertaining to budget and examples of allowable and unallowable costs, see the DOJ Grants Financial Guide at <https://ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/index.htm>.

b. Budget Narrative

The budget narrative should thoroughly and clearly describe every category of expense listed in the Budget Detail Worksheet. OJP expects proposed budgets to be complete, cost effective, and allowable (e.g., reasonable, allocable, and necessary for project activities).

An applicant should demonstrate in its budget narrative how it will maximize cost effectiveness of award expenditures. Budget narratives should generally describe cost effectiveness in relation to potential alternatives and the goals of the project. For example, a budget narrative should detail why planned in-person meetings are

necessary, or how technology and collaboration with outside organizations could be used to reduce costs, without compromising quality.

The budget narrative should be mathematically sound and correspond clearly with the information and figures provided in the Budget Detail Worksheet. The narrative should explain how the applicant estimated and calculated all costs, and how those costs are necessary to the completion of the proposed project. The narrative may include tables for clarification purposes, but need not be in a spreadsheet format. As with the Budget Detail Worksheet, the budget narrative should describe costs by year.

c. Cofunding

An award made by NIJ under this solicitation may account for up to 100 percent of the total cost of the project. The application should indicate whether it is feasible for the applicant to contribute cash, facilities, or services as non-federal support for the project. The application should identify generally any such contributions that the applicant expects to make and the proposed budget should indicate in detail which items, if any, will be supported with non-federal contributions.

For additional match information, see the [Cost Sharing or Match Requirement](#) section under [Section B. Federal Award Information](#).

If a successful application proposes a voluntary match amount, and OJP approves the budget, the total match amount incorporated into the approved budget becomes mandatory and subject to audit.

d. Information on Proposed Subawards (if any), as well as on Proposed Procurement Contracts (if any)

Applicants for OJP awards typically may propose to make *subawards*. Applicants also may propose to enter into procurement *contracts* under the award.

Whether an action – for federal grants administrative purposes – is a subaward or procurement contract is a critical distinction as significantly different rules apply to subawards and procurement contracts. If a recipient enters into an agreement that is a subaward of an OJP award, specific rules apply – many of which are set by federal statutes and DOJ regulations; others by award conditions. These rules place particular responsibilities on an OJP recipient for any subawards the OJP recipient may make. The rules determine much of what the written subaward agreement itself must require or provide. The rules also determine much of what an OJP recipient must do both before and after it makes a subaward. If a recipient enters into an agreement that is a procurement contract under an OJP award, a substantially different set of federal rules applies.

OJP has developed the following guidance documents to help clarify the differences between subawards and procurement contracts under an OJP award and outline the compliance and reporting requirements for each. This information can be accessed online at <https://ojp.gov/training/training.htm>.

- [Subawards under OJP Awards and Procurement Contracts under Awards: A Toolkit for OJP Recipients.](#)

- [Checklist to Determine Subrecipient or Contractor Classification.](#)
- [Sole Source Justification Fact Sheet and Sole Source Review Checklist.](#)

In general, the central question is the relationship between what the third-party will do under its agreement with the recipient and what the recipient has committed (to OJP) to do under its award to further a public purpose (e.g., services the recipient will provide, products it will develop or modify, research or evaluation it will conduct). If a third party will provide some of the services the recipient has committed (to OJP) to provide, will develop or modify all or part of a product the recipient has committed (to OJP) to develop or modify, or will conduct part of the research or evaluation the recipient has committed (to OJP) to conduct, OJP will consider the agreement with the third party a *subaward* for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements.

This will be true **even if** the recipient, for internal or other non-federal purposes, labels or treats its agreement as a procurement, a contract, or a procurement contract. Neither the title nor the structure of an agreement determines whether the agreement -- for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements -- is a *subaward* or is instead a procurement *contract* under an award. The substance of the relationship should be given greater consideration than the form of agreement between the recipient and the outside entity.

1. Information on proposed subawards

A recipient of an OJP award may not make subawards ("subgrants") unless the recipient has specific federal authorization to do so. Unless an applicable statute or DOJ regulation specifically authorizes (or requires) subawards, a recipient must have authorization from OJP before it may make a subaward.

A particular subaward may be authorized by OJP because the recipient included a sufficiently-detailed description and justification of the proposed subaward in the Program Narrative, Budget Detail Worksheet, and Budget Narrative as approved by OJP. If, however, a particular subaward is not authorized by federal statute or regulation, and is not approved by OJP, the recipient will be required, post-award, to request and obtain written authorization from OJP before it may make the subaward.

If an applicant proposes to make one or more subawards to carry out the federal award and program, the applicant should-- (1) identify (if known) the proposed subrecipient(s), (2) describe in detail what each subrecipient will do to carry out the federal award and federal program, and (3) provide a justification for the subaward(s), with details on pertinent matters such as special qualifications and areas of expertise. Pertinent information on subawards should appear not only in the Program Narrative, but also in the Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative.

2. Information on proposed procurement contracts (with specific justification for proposed noncompetitive contracts over \$150,000)

Unlike a recipient contemplating a subaward, a recipient of an OJP award generally does not need specific prior federal authorization to enter into an agreement that -- for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements -- is considered a

procurement contract, **provided that** (1) the recipient uses its own documented procurement procedures and (2) those procedures conform to applicable federal law, including the Procurement Standards of the (DOJ) Part 200 Uniform Requirements (as set out at 2 C.F.R. 200.317 - 200.326). The Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative should identify proposed procurement contracts. (As discussed above, subawards must be identified and described separately from procurement contracts.)

The Procurement Standards in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements, however, reflect a general expectation that agreements that (for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements) constitute procurement “contracts” under awards will be entered into on the basis of full and open competition. All noncompetitive (sole source) procurement contracts must meet the OJP requirements outlined at <https://ojp.gov/training/subawards-procurement.htm>. If a proposed procurement contract would exceed the simplified acquisition threshold -- currently, \$150,000 -- a recipient of an OJP award may not proceed without competition unless and until the recipient receives specific advance authorization from OJP to use a non-competitive approach for the procurement. An applicant that (at the time of its application) intends – without competition – to enter into a procurement contract that would exceed \$150,000 should include a detailed justification that explains to OJP why, in the particular circumstances, it is appropriate to proceed without competition.

If the applicant receives an award, sole source procurements that do not exceed the Simplified Acquisition Threshold (currently \$150,000) must have written justification for the noncompetitive procurement action maintained in the procurement file. If a procurement file does not have the documentation that meets the criteria outlined in 2 C.F.R. 200, the procurement expenditures may not be allowable. Sole source procurement over the \$150,000 Simplified Acquisition Threshold must have prior approval from OJP using a Sole Source Grant Adjustment Notice (GAN). Written documentation justifying the noncompetitive procurement must be submitted with the GAN and maintained in the procurement file.

e. Pre-Agreement Costs

For information on preagreement costs, see [Section B. Federal Award Information](#).

5. Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable)

Indirect costs may be charged to an award only if:

- (a) The recipient has a current (unexpired), federally approved indirect cost rate; or
- (b) The recipient is eligible to use, and elects to use, the “de minimis” indirect cost rate described in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements, as set out at 2 C.F.R. 200.414(f).

An applicant with a current (unexpired) federally-approved indirect cost rate is to attach a copy of the indirect cost rate agreement to the application. An applicant that does not have a current federally-approved rate may request one through its cognizant federal agency, which will review all documentation and approve a rate for the applicant entity, or, if the applicant’s accounting system permits, applicants may propose to allocate costs in the direct cost categories.

For assistance with identifying the appropriate cognizant federal agency for indirect costs, please contact the Office of the Chief Financial Officer Customer Service Center at 1-800-458-0786 or at ask.ocfo@usdoj.gov. If DOJ is the cognizant federal agency, an applicant may obtain information needed to submit an indirect cost rate proposal at <https://www.ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/IndirectCosts.pdf>.

Certain OJP recipients have the option of electing to use the “de minimis” indirect cost rate. An applicant that is eligible to use the “de minimis” rate that wishes to use the “de minimis” rate should attach written documentation to the application that advises OJP of both-- (1) the applicant’s eligibility to use the “de minimis” rate, and (2) its election to do so. If an eligible applicant elects the “de minimis” rate, costs must be consistently charged as either indirect or direct costs, but may not be double charged or inconsistently charged as both. The “de minimis” rate may no longer be used once an approved federally-negotiated indirect cost rate is in place. (No entity that ever has had a federally-approved negotiated indirect cost rate is eligible to use the “de minimis” rate.) For additional eligibility requirements please see Part 200 Uniform Requirements, as set out at https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?node=se2.1.200_1414&rqn=div8.

6. Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable)

A tribe, tribal organization, or third party that proposes to provide direct services or assistance to residents on tribal lands should include in its application a resolution, letter, affidavit, or other documentation, as appropriate, that demonstrates (as a legal matter) that the applicant has the requisite authorization from the tribe(s) to implement the proposed project on tribal lands. In those instances when an organization or consortium of tribes applies for an award on behalf of a tribe or multiple specific tribes, the application should include appropriate legal documentation, as described above, from all tribes that would receive services or assistance under the award. A consortium of tribes for which existing consortium bylaws allow action without support from all tribes in the consortium (i.e., without an authorizing resolution or comparable legal documentation from each tribal governing body) may submit, instead, a copy of its consortium bylaws with the application.

7. Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire (including applicant disclosure of high-risk status)

Every OJP applicant (other than an individual applying in his or her personal capacity) is required to download, complete, and submit the OJP Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire (Questionnaire) at <https://ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/FinancialCapability.pdf> as part of its application. The Questionnaire helps OJP assess the financial management and internal control systems, and the associated potential risks of an applicant as part of the pre-award risk assessment process.

The Questionnaire should only be completed by financial staff most familiar with the applicant's systems, policies, and procedures in order to ensure that the correct responses are recorded and submitted to OJP. The responses on the Questionnaire directly impact the pre-award risk assessment and should accurately reflect the applicant's financial management and internal control system at the time of the application. The pre-award risk assessment is only one of multiple factors and criteria used in determining funding. However, a pre-award risk assessment that indicates that an applicant poses a higher risk to OJP may affect the funding decision and/or result in additional reporting requirements,

monitoring, special conditions, withholding of award funds, or other additional award requirements.

Among other things, the form requires each applicant to disclose whether it currently is designated “high risk” by a federal grant-making agency outside of DOJ. For purposes of this disclosure, high risk includes any status under which a federal awarding agency provides additional oversight due to the applicant’s past performance, or other programmatic or financial concerns with the applicant. If an applicant is designated high risk by another federal awarding agency, the applicant must provide the following information:

- The federal awarding agency that currently designates the applicant high risk.
- The date the applicant was designated high risk.
- The high-risk point of contact at that federal awarding agency (name, phone number, and email address).
- The reasons for the high-risk status, as set out by the federal awarding agency.

OJP seeks this information to help ensure appropriate federal oversight of OJP awards. An applicant that is considered “high-risk” by another federal awarding agency is not automatically disqualified from receiving an OJP award. OJP may, however, consider the information in award decisions, and may impose additional OJP oversight of any award under this solicitation (including through the conditions that accompany the award document).

8. Disclosure of Lobbying Activities

Each applicant must complete and submit this information. An applicant that expends any funds for lobbying activities is to provide all of the information requested on the form Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL) posted at <https://ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/Disclosure.pdf>. An applicant that does not expend any funds for lobbying activities is to enter “N/A” in the text boxes for item 10 (“a. Name and Address of Lobbying Registrant” and “b. Individuals Performing Services”).

9. Additional Attachments

a. Applicant disclosure of pending applications¹⁹

Each applicant is to disclose whether it has (or is proposed as a subrecipient under) any pending applications for federally-funded grants or cooperative agreements that (1) include requests for funding to support the same project being proposed in the application under this solicitation, and (2) would cover the identical cost items outlined in the budget submitted to OJP under this solicitation. The applicant is to disclose both applications made directly to federal awarding agencies, and also applications for subawards of federal funds (e.g., applications to State agencies that will subaward (“subgrant”) federal funds).

¹⁹ Typically, the applicant is **not** the principal investigator. Rather, the applicant, most frequently, is the institution, organization, or company in which the principal investigator is employed.

OJP seeks this information to help avoid inappropriate duplication of funding. Leveraging multiple funding sources in a complementary manner to implement comprehensive programs or projects is encouraged and is not seen as inappropriate duplication.

Each applicant that has one or more pending applications as described above is to provide the following information about pending applications submitted within the last 12 months:

- The federal or State funding agency.
- The solicitation name/project name.
- The point of contact information at the applicable federal or State funding agency.

Federal or State Funding Agency	Solicitation Name/Project Name	Name/Phone/E-mail for Point of Contact at Federal or State Funding Agency
DOJ/Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS)	COPS Hiring Program	Jane Doe, 202/000-0000; jane.doe@usdoj.gov
Health and Human Services/ Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration	Drug-Free Communities Mentoring Program/North County Youth Mentoring Program	John Doe, 202/000-0000; john.doe@hhs.gov

Each applicant should include the table as a separate attachment to its application. The file should be named “Disclosure of Pending Applications.” The applicant’s Legal Name on the application must match the entity named on the disclosure of pending applications statement.

Any applicant that does not have any pending applications as described above is to submit, as a separate attachment, a statement to this effect: “[Applicant Name on SF-424] does not have (and is not proposed as a subrecipient under) any pending applications submitted within the last 12 months for federally-funded grants or cooperative agreements or for subawards under federal grants or cooperative agreements) that request funding to support the same project being proposed in this application to OJP and that would cover the identical cost items outlined in the budget submitted as part of this application.”

b. Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity

When an application proposes research (including research and development) and/or evaluation, the applicant must demonstrate research/evaluation independence and integrity, including appropriate safeguards, before it may receive award funds. The

applicant must demonstrate independence and integrity regarding both this proposed research and/or evaluation, and any current or prior related projects.

Each application should include an attachment that addresses **both** i. and ii. below.

- i. For purposes of this solicitation, each applicant is to document research and evaluation independence and integrity by including one of the following two items:
 - a. A specific assurance that the applicant has reviewed its application to identify any actual or potential apparent conflicts of interest (including through review of pertinent information on the principal investigator, any co-principal investigators, and any subrecipients), and that the applicant has identified no such conflicts of interest – whether personal or financial or organizational (including on the part of the applicant entity or on the part of staff, investigators, or subrecipients) – that could affect the independence or integrity of the research, including the design, conduct, and reporting of the research.

OR

- b. A specific description of actual or potential apparent conflicts of interest that the applicant has identified – including through review of pertinent information on the principal investigator, any co-principal investigators, and any subrecipients – that could affect the independence or integrity of the research, including the design, conduct, or reporting of the research. These conflicts may be personal (e.g., on the part of investigators or other staff), financial, or organizational (related to the applicant or any subrecipient entity). Some examples of potential investigator (or other personal) conflict situations are those in which an investigator would be in a position to evaluate a spouse's work product (actual conflict), or an investigator would be in a position to evaluate the work of a former or current colleague (potential apparent conflict). With regard to potential organizational conflicts of interest, as one example, generally an organization would not be given an award to evaluate a project, if that organization had itself provided substantial prior technical assistance to that specific project or a location implementing the project (whether funded by OJP or other sources), because the organization in such an instance might appear to be evaluating the effectiveness of its own prior work. The key is whether a reasonable person understanding all of the facts would be able to have confidence that the results of any research or evaluation project are objective and reliable. Any outside personal or financial interest that casts doubt on that objectivity and reliability of an evaluation or research product is a problem and must be disclosed.
- ii. In addition, for purposes of this solicitation, each applicant is to address possible mitigation of research integrity concerns by including, at a minimum, one of the following two items:
 - a. If an applicant reasonably believes that no actual or potential apparent conflicts of interest (personal, financial, or organizational) exist, then the applicant should provide a brief narrative explanation of how and why it reached that conclusion. The applicant also is to include an explanation of the

specific processes and procedures that the applicant has in place, or will put in place, to identify and prevent (or, at the very least, mitigate) any such conflicts of interest pertinent to the funded project during the period of performance. Documentation that may be helpful in this regard may include organizational codes of ethics/conduct and policies regarding organizational, personal, and financial conflicts of interest. There is no guarantee that the plan, if any, will be accepted as proposed.

OR

- b. If the applicant has identified actual or potential apparent conflicts of interest (personal, financial, or organizational) that could affect the independence and integrity of the research, including the design, conduct, or reporting of the research, the applicant is to provide a specific and robust mitigation plan to address each of those conflicts. At a minimum, the applicant is expected to explain the specific processes and procedures that the applicant has in place, or will put in place, to identify and eliminate (or, at the very least, mitigate) any such conflicts of interest pertinent to the funded project during the period of performance. Documentation that may be helpful in this regard may include organizational codes of ethics/conduct and policies regarding organizational, personal, and financial conflicts of interest. There is no guarantee that the plan, if any, will be accepted as proposed.

OJP will assess research and evaluation independence and integrity based on considerations such as the adequacy of the applicant's efforts to identify factors that could affect the objectivity or integrity of the proposed staff and/or the applicant entity (and any subrecipients) in carrying out the research, development, or evaluation activity; and the adequacy of the applicant's existing or proposed remedies to control any such factors.

■ [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

How to Apply

Applicants must register in and submit applications through Grants.gov, a primary source to find federal funding opportunities and apply for funding. Find complete instructions on how to register and submit an application at <https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/support.html>. Applicants that experience technical difficulties during this process should call the Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline at **800-518-4726** or **606-545-5035**, which operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, except on federal holidays.

Important Grants.gov update. Grants.gov has updated its application tool. The legacy PDF application package has been phased out and was retired on December 31, 2017. Grants.gov Workspace is now the standard application method for applying for grants. OJP applicants should familiarize themselves with the Workspace option now. For complete information and instructions on using Workspace (and other changes), go to the Workspace Overview page at <https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants/workspace-overview.html>.

Registering with Grants.gov is a one-time process; however, **processing delays may occur, and it can take several weeks** for first-time registrants to receive confirmation of registration and a user password. OJP encourages applicants to **register several weeks before** the application submission deadline. In addition, OJP urges applicants to submit applications at

least 72 hours prior to the application due date, in order to allow time for the applicant to receive validation messages or rejection notifications from Grants.gov, and to correct in a timely fashion any problems that may have caused a rejection notification.

OJP strongly encourages all prospective applicants to sign up for Grants.gov email notifications regarding this solicitation at <https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/manage-subscriptions.html>. If this solicitation is cancelled or modified, individuals who sign up with Grants.gov for updates will be automatically notified.

Browser Information: Grants.gov was built to be compatible with Internet Explorer. For technical assistance with Google Chrome, or another browser, contact Grants.gov Customer Support.

Note on Attachments. Grants.gov has two categories of files for attachments: “mandatory” and “optional.” OJP receives all files attached in both categories. Attachments are also labeled to describe the file being attached (e.g., Project Narrative, Budget Narrative, Other, etc.) Please ensure that all required documents are attached in the correct Grants.gov category and are labeled correctly. Do not embed “mandatory” attachments within another file.

Note on File Names and File Types: Grants.gov only permits the use of certain specific characters in file names of attachments. Valid file names may include only the characters shown in the table below. Grants.gov rejects any application that includes an attachment(s) with a file name that contains any characters not shown in the table below. Grants.gov forwards successfully-submitted applications to the OJP Grants Management System (GMS).

Characters
Upper case (A – Z)
Lower case (a – z)
Underscore (_)
Hyphen (-)
Space
Period (.)

Special Characters		
Parenthesis ()	Curly braces { }	Square brackets []
Ampersand (&)*	Tilde (~)	Exclamation point (!)
Comma (,)	Semicolon (;)	Apostrophe (‘)
At sign (@)	Number sign (#)	Dollar sign (\$)
Percent sign (%)	Plus sign (+)	Equal sign (=)

***When using the ampersand (&) in XML, applicants must use the “&” format.**

GMS does not accept executable file types as application attachments. These disallowed file types include, but are not limited to, the following extensions: “.com,” “.bat,” “.exe,” “.vbs,” “.cfg,” “.dat,” “.db,” “.dbf,” “.dll,” “.ini,” “.log,” “.ora,” “.sys,” and “.zip.” GMS may reject applications with files that use these extensions. It is important to allow time to change the type of file(s) if the application is rejected.

All applicants are required to complete the following steps:

Unique Entity Identifier (DUNS Number) and System for Award Management (SAM)

Every applicant entity must comply with all applicable System for Award Management (SAM) and unique entity identifier (currently, a Data Universal Numbering System [DUNS] number) requirements. SAM is the repository for certain standard information about federal financial assistance applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. A DUNS number is a unique nine-digit identification number provided by the commercial company Dun and Bradstreet. More detailed information about SAM and the DUNS number is in the numbered sections below.

If an applicant entity has not fully complied with the applicable SAM and unique identifier requirements by the time OJP makes award decisions, OJP may determine that the applicant is not qualified to receive an award and may use that determination as a basis for making the award to a different applicant.

Applying as an Individual

An individual who wishes to apply in his/her personal capacity should search Grants.gov for funding opportunities for which individuals are eligible to apply. Use the Funding Opportunity Number (FON) to register. (An applicant applying as an individual must comply with all applicable Grants.gov individual registration requirements.)

Enter the FON at <https://apply07.grants.gov/apply/IndCPRRegister> to complete the registration form and create a username and password for Grants.gov. (An applicant applying as an individual should complete all steps except 1, 2 and 4.)

Registration and Submission Steps

- 1. Acquire a unique entity identifier (currently, a DUNS number).** In general, the Office of Management and Budget requires every applicant for a federal award (other than an individual) to include a "unique entity identifier" in each application, including an application for a supplemental award. Currently, a DUNS number is the required unique entity identifier.

This unique entity identifier is used for tracking purposes, and to validate address and point of contact information for applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. It will be used throughout the life cycle of an OJP award. Obtaining a DUNS number is a free, one-time activity. Call Dun and Bradstreet at 866-705-5711 to obtain a DUNS number or apply online at www.dnb.com. A DUNS number is usually received within 1-2 business days.

- 2. Acquire or maintain registration with SAM.** All applicants for OJP awards (other than individuals) must maintain current registrations in the SAM database. Applicants will need the authorizing official of the organization and an Employer Identification Number (EIN). An applicant must be registered in SAM to successfully register in Grants.gov. Each applicant must **update or renew its SAM registration at least annually** to maintain an active status. SAM registration and renewal can take as long as 10 business days to complete (2 more weeks to acquire an EIN).

An application cannot be successfully submitted in Grants.gov until Grants.gov receives the SAM registration information. Once the SAM registration/renewal is complete, **the information transfer from SAM to Grants.gov can take as long as 48 hours.** OJP recommends that the applicant register or renew registration with SAM as early as possible.

Information about SAM registration procedures can be accessed at www.sam.gov.

- 3. Acquire an Authorized Organization Representative (AOR) and a Grants.gov username and password.** Complete the AOR profile on Grants.gov and create a username and password. An applicant entity's "unique entity identifier" (DUNS number) must be used to complete this step. For more information about the registration process for organizations and other entities, go to <https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants/organization->

[registration.html](https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants/registration.html). Individuals registering with Grants.gov should go to <https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants/registration.html>.

4. **Acquire confirmation for the AOR from the E-Business Point of Contact (E-Biz POC).** The E-Biz POC at the applicant organization must log into Grants.gov to “confirm” the applicant organization’s AOR. The E-Biz POC will need the Marketing Partner Identification Number (MPIN) password obtained when registering with SAM to complete this step. Note that an organization can have more than one AOR.
5. **Search for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov.** Use the following identifying information when searching for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov. The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number for this solicitation is 16.560; National Institute of Justice Research, Evaluation, and Development Project Grants and the funding opportunity number is NIJ-2018-14001.
6. **Access Funding Opportunity and Application Package from Grants.gov.** Select “Apply for Grants” under the “Applicants” column. Enter your email address to be notified of any changes to the opportunity package before the closing date. Click the Workspace icon to use Grants.gov Workspace.
7. **Submit a valid application consistent with this solicitation by following the directions in Grants.gov.** Within 24-48 hours after submitting the electronic application, the applicant should receive two notifications from Grants.gov. The first will confirm the receipt of the application. The second will state whether the application has been validated and successfully submitted, or whether it has been rejected due to errors, with an explanation. It is possible to first receive a message indicating that the application is received, and then receive a rejection notice a few minutes or hours later. Submitting an application well ahead of the deadline provides time to correct the problem(s) that caused the rejection. **Important:** OJP urges each applicant to submit its application **at least 72 hours prior** to the application due date, to allow time to receive validation messages or rejection notifications from Grants.gov, and to correct in a timely fashion any problems that may have caused a rejection notification. Applications must be successfully submitted through Grants.gov by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on May 14, 2018.

Click <https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants/organization-registration.html> for further details on DUNS numbers, SAM, and Grants.gov registration steps and timeframes.

Note: Application Versions

If an applicant submits multiple versions of the same application, OJP will review only the most recent system-validated version submitted.

Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues

An applicant that experiences unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond its control that prevent it from submitting its application by the deadline must contact the [Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline](https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/support.html) at <https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/support.html> or the [SAM Help Desk](https://www.fsd.gov/fsd-gov/home.do) (Federal Service Desk) at <https://www.fsd.gov/fsd-gov/home.do> to report the technical issue and receive a tracking number. The applicant must e-mail the NIJ contact identified in the Contact Information section on the title page **within 24 hours after the application deadline** to request approval to submit its application after the deadline. The applicant’s e-mail must describe the

technical difficulties, and must include a timeline of the applicant's submission efforts, the complete grant application, the applicant's DUNS number, and any Grants.gov Help Desk or SAM tracking number(s).

Note: OJP does not automatically approve requests to submit a late application. After OJP reviews the applicant's request, and contacts the Grants.gov or SAM Help Desks to verify the reported technical issues, OJP will inform the applicant whether the request to submit a late application has been approved or denied. If OJP determines that the untimely application submission was due to the applicant's failure to follow all required procedures, OJP will deny the applicant's request to submit its application.

The following conditions generally are insufficient to justify late submissions:

- Failure to register in SAM or Grants.gov in sufficient time (SAM registration and renewal can take as long as 10 business days to complete. The information transfer from SAM to Grants.gov can take up to 48 hours.)
- Failure to follow Grants.gov instructions on how to register and apply as posted on its website.
- Failure to follow each instruction in the OJP solicitation.
- Technical issues with the applicant's computer or information technology environment, such as issues with firewalls or browser incompatibility.

Notifications regarding known technical problems with Grants.gov, if any, are posted at the top of the OJP Funding Resource Center at <https://ojp.gov/funding/index.htm>.

E. Application Review Information

Review Criteria

Applications that meet basic minimum requirements will be evaluated by peer reviewers using the following review criteria. Each individual criterion is assigned a different weight based on the percentage value listed. For example, the first criterion, Statement of the Problem, is worth 10 percent of the score in the assessment of the application's technical merit.

Statement of the Problem and Research Questions (Understanding of the problem, research questions, and their importance) – 10%

1. Demonstrated understanding of the problem.
2. Demonstrated importance of research questions, goals and objectives, including alignment with the aims of the solicitation.
3. Demonstrated awareness of the state of current research.

Project Design and Implementation (Quality and technical merit) – 50%

1. Soundness of methods and analytic and technical approach to addressing the stated aim(s) of the proposed project.
2. Feasibility of proposed project.
3. Awareness of potential pitfalls of proposed project design and feasibility of proposed actions to minimize and/or mitigate them.
4. Feasibility of completing the deliverables noted in the solicitation.

Potential Impact – 20%

Potential for a significant scientific or technical advance(s) that will improve criminal/juvenile justice in the United States, such as:

- Potential for significantly improved understanding of the stated criminal/juvenile justice problem.
- Potential for innovative solution to address (all or a significant part of) the stated criminal/juvenile justice problem.

Capabilities/Competencies (Capabilities, demonstrated productivity, and experience of the applicant organization and proposed project staff) – 20%

1. Qualifications and experience of proposed project staff (that is, the principal investigator, any and all co-principal investigators, and all other individuals (and organizations) identified in the application (regardless of “investigator” status) who will be significantly involved in substantive aspects of the proposed project).
2. Demonstrated ability of the applicant organization to implement the proposed strategies and manage the effort.
3. Relationship between the capabilities/competencies of the proposed project staff (including the applicant organization) and the scope and strategies of the proposed project.

Budget

In addition, peer reviewers will consider and may comment on the following additional items in the context of scientific and technical merit.

1. Total cost of the project relative to the perceived benefit (cost effectiveness).
2. Appropriateness of the budget relative to the level of effort.
3. Use of existing resources to conserve costs.
4. Alignment of the proposed budget with proposed project activities.

5. Proposed plan (if any) to produce or to make available to broader interested audiences, such as criminal/juvenile justice practitioners or policymakers, summary information from the planned scholarly products of the project.

Plan for Dissemination to Broader Audiences (if applicable to the proposed project)

Peer reviewers may comment—in the context of scientific and technical merit—on the proposed plan (if any) to produce or to make available to broader interested audiences, such as criminal/juvenile justice practitioners or policymakers, summary information from the planned scholarly products of the project.

Review Process

OJP is committed to ensuring a fair and open process for making awards. NIJ reviews the application to make sure that the information presented is reasonable, understandable, measurable, and achievable, as well as consistent with the solicitation.

Peer reviewers will review the applications submitted under this solicitation that meet basic minimum requirements. For purposes of assessing whether an application meets basic minimum requirements and should proceed to further consideration, OJP screens applications for compliance with those requirements. Although specific requirements may vary, the following are common requirements applicable to all solicitations for funding under OJP programs:

- The application must be submitted by an eligible type of applicant.
- The application must request funding within programmatic funding constraints (if applicable).
- The application must be responsive to the scope of the solicitation.
- The application must include all items designated as “critical elements.”
- The applicant must not be identified in SAM as excluded from receiving federal awards.

For a list of the critical elements for this solicitation, see “What an Application Should Include” under [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#).

Peer review panels will evaluate, score, and rate applications that meet basic minimum requirements. NIJ may use internal peer reviewers, external peer reviewers, or a combination, to assess applications on technical merit using the solicitation’s review criteria. An external peer reviewer is an expert in the subject matter of a given solicitation who is not a current DOJ employee. An internal reviewer is a current DOJ employee who is well-versed or has expertise in the subject matter of this solicitation. Peer reviewers’ ratings and any resulting recommendations are advisory only, although reviewer views are considered carefully. Other important considerations for NIJ include geographic diversity, strategic priorities, and available funding, as well as the planned scholarly products and the extent to which the budget detail worksheet and budget narrative accurately explain project costs that are reasonable, necessary, and otherwise allowable under federal law and applicable federal cost principles.

Pursuant to the Part 200 Uniform Requirements, before award decisions are made, OJP also reviews information related to the degree of risk posed by applicants. Among other things to help assess whether an applicant that has one or more prior federal awards has a satisfactory record with respect to performance, integrity, and business ethics, OJP checks whether the applicant is listed in SAM as excluded from receiving a federal award. In addition, if OJP anticipates that an award will exceed \$150,000 in federal funds, OJP also must review and consider any information about the applicant that appears in the non-public segment of the integrity and performance system accessible through SAM (currently, the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System; "FAPIS").

Important note on FAPIS: An applicant, at its option, may review and comment on any information about itself that currently appears in FAPIS and was entered by a federal awarding agency. OJP will consider any such comments by the applicant, in addition to the other information in FAPIS, in its assessment of the risk posed by the applicant.

The evaluation of risks goes beyond information in SAM, however. OJP itself has in place a framework for evaluating risks posed by applicants for competitive awards. OJP takes into account information pertinent to matters such as —

1. Applicant financial stability and fiscal integrity.
2. Quality of the applicant's management systems, and applicant's ability to meet prescribed management standards, including those outlined in the DOJ Grants Financial Guide.
3. Applicant's history of performance under OJP and other DOJ awards (including scholarly products, and compliance with reporting requirements and award conditions), as well as awards from other federal agencies.
4. Reports and findings from audits of the applicant, including audits under the Part 200 Uniform Requirements.
5. Applicant's ability to comply with statutory and regulatory requirements, and to effectively implement other award requirements.

All final award decisions for will be made by the Director of the National Institute of Justice, who may take into account not only peer review ratings and NIJ recommendations, but also other factors as indicated in this section. The NIJ Director may also take into consideration whether the principal investigator is new to their career and new to NIJ's research grant portfolios, and meets the criteria outlined on page 11 of this solicitation.

F. Federal Award Administration Information

Federal Award Notices

Award notifications will be made by September 30, 2018. OJP sends award notifications by email through GMS to the individuals listed in the application as the point of contact and the authorizing official (E-Biz POC and AOR). The email notification includes detailed instructions on how to access and view the award documents, and steps to take in GMS to start the award

acceptance process. GMS automatically issues the notifications at 9:00 p.m. eastern time on the award date.

For each successful applicant, an individual with the necessary authority to bind the applicant will be required to login; execute a set of legal certifications and a set of legal assurances; designate a financial point of contact; thoroughly review the award, including all award conditions; and sign and accept the award. The award acceptance process requires physical signature of the award document by the authorized representative and the scanning and submission of the fully-executed award document to OJP.

Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements

If selected for funding, in addition to implementing the funded project consistent with the OJP-approved application, the recipient must comply with all award conditions, as well as all applicable requirements of federal statutes and regulations (including applicable requirements referred to in the assurances and certifications executed in connection with award acceptance). OJP strongly encourages prospective applicants to review information on post-award legal requirements and common OJP award conditions **prior** to submitting an application.

Applicants should consult the “[Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2018 Awards](#)”, available in the OJP Funding Resource Center at <https://ojp.gov/funding/index.htm>. In addition, applicants should examine the following two legal documents, as each successful applicant must execute both documents before it may receive any award funds. (An applicant is not required to submit these documents as part of an application.)

- [Certifications Regarding Lobbying; Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters; and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements.](#)
- [Certified Standard Assurances.](#)

The webpages accessible through the “[Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2018 Awards](#)” are intended to give applicants for OJP awards a general overview of important statutes, regulations, and award conditions that apply to many (or in some cases, all) OJP grants and cooperative agreements awarded in FY 2018. Individual OJP awards typically also will include additional award conditions. Those additional conditions may relate to the particular statute, program, or solicitation under which the award is made; to the substance of the funded application; to the recipient's performance under other federal awards; to the recipient's legal status (e.g., as a for-profit entity); or to other pertinent considerations.

As stated above, NIJ expects that it will make any award under this solicitation in the form of a grant or cooperative agreement. Any award made as a cooperative agreement will include a condition in the award document that sets out the nature of the “substantial federal involvement” in carrying out the award and program. Generally stated, under OJP cooperative agreement awards, responsibility for the day-to-day conduct of the funded project rests with the recipient. OJP, however, may have substantial involvement in matters such as substantive coordination of technical efforts and site selection, as well as review and approval of project work plans, research designs, data collection instruments, and major project-generated materials. In

addition, OJP often indicates in the award terms and conditions that it may redirect the project if necessary.

In addition to an award condition that sets out the nature of the anticipated “substantial federal involvement” in the award, cooperative agreements awarded by OJP include an award condition that requires specific reporting in connection with conferences, meetings, retreats, seminars, symposium, training activities, or similar events funded under the award.

General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements

In addition to the deliverables and expected scholarly products described in [Section A. Program Description](#), any recipient of an award under this solicitation will be required to submit the following reports and data.

Required reports. Recipients typically must submit quarterly financial reports, semi-annual progress reports, final financial and progress reports, and, if applicable, an annual audit report in accordance with the Part 200 Uniform Requirements or specific award conditions. Applicants should anticipate that progress reports will be required to follow the non-budgetary components of the Research Performance Progress Report (RPPR) template/format. General information on RPPRs may be found at www.nsf.gov/bfa/dias/policy/rppr/. Future awards and fund drawdowns may be withheld if reports are delinquent. (In appropriate cases, OJP may require additional reports.)

Awards that exceed \$500,000 will include an additional condition that, under specific circumstances, will require the recipient to report (to FAPIIS) information on civil, criminal, and administrative proceedings connected with (or connected to the performance of) either the OJP award or any other grant, cooperative agreement, or procurement contract from the federal government. Additional information on this reporting requirement appears in the text of the award condition posted on the OJP webpage at <https://ojp.gov/funding/FAPIIS.htm>.

Data on performance measures. In addition to required reports, an award recipient under this solicitation also must provide data that measure the results of the work done under the award. To demonstrate program progress and success, as well as to assist DOJ with fulfilling its responsibilities under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA), Public Law 103-62, and the GPRA Modernization Act of 2010, Public Law 111-352, OJP will require any award recipient, post award, to provide performance data listed as part of regular progress reporting. Successful applicants will be required to access OJP’s performance measurement page at www.ojp.gov/performance to view the specific reporting requirements for this grant program.

G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)

For questions directed to the Federal Awarding Agency, see NCJRS contact information on the title page.

For contact information for Grants.gov, see the title page.

H. Other Information

Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552 and 5 U.S.C. 552a)

All applications submitted to OJP (including all attachments to applications) are subject to the federal Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and to the Privacy Act. By law, DOJ may withhold information that is responsive to a request pursuant to FOIA if DOJ determines that the responsive information either is protected under the Privacy Act or falls within the scope of one of nine statutory exemptions under FOIA. DOJ cannot agree in advance of a request pursuant to FOIA not to release some or all portions of an application.

In its review of records that are responsive to a FOIA request, OJP will withhold information in those records that plainly falls within the scope of the Privacy Act or one of the statutory exemptions under FOIA. (Some examples include certain types of information in budgets, and names and contact information for project staff other than certain key personnel.) In appropriate circumstances, OJP will request the views of the applicant/recipient that submitted a responsive document.

For example, if OJP receives a request pursuant to FOIA for an application submitted by a nonprofit or for-profit organization or an institution of higher education, or for an application that involves research, OJP typically will contact the applicant/recipient that submitted the application and ask it to identify -- quite precisely -- any particular information in the application that the applicant/recipient believes falls under a FOIA exemption, the specific exemption it believes applies, and why. After considering the submission by the applicant/recipient, OJP makes an independent assessment regarding withholding information. OJP generally follows a similar process for requests pursuant to FOIA for applications that may contain law-enforcement sensitive information.

Provide Feedback to OJP

To assist OJP in improving its application and award processes, OJP encourages applicants to provide feedback on this solicitation, the application submission process, and/or the application review process. Provide feedback to OJPSolicitationFeedback@usdoj.gov.

IMPORTANT: This e-mail is for feedback and suggestions only. OJP does not send replies from this mailbox to messages it receives in this mailbox. Any prospective applicant that has specific questions on any program or technical aspect of the solicitation **must** use the appropriate telephone number or e-mail listed on the front of this solicitation document to obtain information. These contacts are provided to help ensure that prospective applicants can directly reach an individual who can address specific questions in a timely manner.

If you are interested in being a reviewer for other OJP grant applications, please e-mail your resume to ojppeerreview@l-secb.com. (Do not send your resume to the OJP Solicitation Feedback email account.) **Note:** Neither you nor anyone else from your organization or entity can be a peer reviewer in a competition in which you or your organization/entity has submitted an application.

Application Checklist

Research and Evaluation on the Administration of Justice

This application checklist has been created as an aid in developing an application.

What an Applicant Should Do:

Prior to Registering in Grants.gov:

_____ Acquire a DUNS Number (see page 34)

_____ Acquire or renew registration with SAM (see page 34)

To Register with Grants.gov:

_____ Acquire AOR and Grants.gov username/password (see page 34)

_____ Acquire AOR confirmation from the E-Biz POC (see page 35)

To Find Funding Opportunity:

_____ Search for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov (see page 35)

_____ Access Funding Opportunity and Application Package (see page 35)

_____ Sign up for Grants.gov [email](#) notifications (optional) (see page 33)

_____ Read [Important Notice: Applying for Grants in Grants.gov](#)

_____ Read OJP policy and guidance on conference approval, planning, and reporting available at ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/PostawardRequirements/chapter3.10a.htm (see page 16)

After Application Submission, Receive Grants.gov Email Notifications That:

_____ (1) application has been received

_____ (2) application has either been successfully validated or rejected with errors (see page 35)

If no Grants.gov receipt, and validation or error notifications are received:

_____ Please refer to the section: Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues (see page 35)

Overview of Post-Award Legal Requirements:

_____ Review the [Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2018 Awards](#) in the OJP Funding Resource Center at <https://ojp.gov/funding/index.htm>.

Scope Requirement:

_____ The federal amount requested is within the allowable limit(s).

Eligibility Requirement: See cover page.

What an Application Should Include:

_____ Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) (see page 18)

_____ Project Abstract (if applicable) (see page 18)



_____ Program Narrative (critical element) (see page 19)

_____ Budget Detail Worksheet (critical element) (see page 23)

_____ Budget Narrative (critical element) (see page 23)

_____ Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable) (see page 26)

_____ Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable) (see page 27)

- _____ Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire (see page 27)
- _____ [Disclosure of Lobbying Activities \(SF-LLL\)](#) (see page 28)
- _____ Additional Attachments
 - _____ Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications (see page 28)
 - _____ Curriculum vitae or resume (critical element) (see page 21)
 - _____ Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity (see page 29)
- _____  
Request and Justification for Employee Compensation; Waiver (if applicable)
(see page 16)

Funding Webinar Transcript

On April 4, 2018, NIJ hosted a webinar that provided an overview of the solicitation “Research and Evaluation on the Administration of Justice.”

Following are the transcript and slide presentation from that webinar.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: Good afternoon, everyone, and welcome to today's webinar, “Research and Evaluation on the Administration of Justice,” sponsored by the National Institute of Justice. At this time, I would like to begin the webinar and introduce you to your presenters today — Dr. Brett Chapman and Dr. Linda Truitt, both with the National Institute of Justice.

DR. LINDA TRUITT: Hello, everyone, this is Linda. Welcome to our first webinar on NIJ's solicitation for Research and Evaluation on the Administration of Justice. In this webinar, my colleague Brett Chapman and I will provide guidance on this FY 2018 solicitation, specifically regarding goals, priority topics of interest, grants, and application expectations, with references to resources and details on the application and review process, including some feedback commonly heard from past application reviewers. There are several NIJ staff behind the solicitation and we will do our best to represent everyone. We offer this webinar as an added resource, and anyone can access the archive transcript and overheads of this webinar for future reference. However, please note that all necessary details regarding applications are documented in the solicitation. A linked solicitation is provided in the chat function. The solicitation can be accessed anytime by NIJ's website or through the Grants.gov website, where all applications are submitted online. Following our presentation, we will review any questions received during the webinar.

Please note that we are limited to solicitation clarification and may suggest that you submit outfitting questions to NIJ's contractor at NCJRS after the webinar. Please understand that we are not permitted to discuss potential research projects with applicants. At the end of today's presentation, you will find contact information and instructions on how to submit questions. Sometimes, we archive frequently asked questions with answers on NIJ's website as FAQs, so you may want to look there first. A link to the FAQ webpage is also provided in the chat function.

And then we move along to the next slide; this regards Solicitation Goals. So, this is a new solicitation for NIJ that brings together several lines of research in support of Department of Justice's priorities to reduce violent crime and to strengthen investigation and prosecution efforts. It solicits applications for funding investigator-initiated, interdisciplinary research and evaluation projects related to the administration of justice. This builds upon NIJ's court portfolio that supports research to identify tools, programs, and policies that satisfy criminal justice goals, including public safety, cost-efficiency, and fair and equitable treatment of victims and defendants. The areas range from Eyewitness Evidence to Front-end Intervention Strategies and Enhancing Investigation and Prosecution.

The next slide outlines the topics that NIJ has identified, and there are several listed here. These are described in this solicitation with background information and illustrations of the kinds of research questions of interest to NIJ, if you look at the solicitation (starting on page 4). So, I'll only briefly discuss those here today.

So, for the first, Eyewitness Identification, here, NIJ is interested in taking what we know from the science on human memory and applying it to the challenge of accuracy in eyewitness identification. Research has shown that the conditions under which a memory is formed (stress, fatigue, etc.) can influence how accurately you recall information later. In addition, how someone is prompted to recall events — you're given feedback on your answer or choose between options — can also impact accuracy of memory recall. NIJ is interested in proposals that look at how these conditions at the time of the crime — an estimated variable — can influence later identification as well as proposals that look at how investigator cues and procedures — also known as systemic variables — can influence identification accuracy. This is all in pursuit of a larger goal of minimizing false identifications that compromise eyewitness identification evidence.

Next is Diversion and Deflection. This references both law enforcement deflection pre- and post-arrest programs and prosecutor-led diversion programs. These programs are intended to address certain low-level offenders prior to court involvement and hopefully redirect them away from the criminal justice system to reserve resources for more serious offenders. Programs may target substance use disorder, serious mental illness, and/or other rehabilitated services and support needs. NIJ is interested in impact of deflection and diversion programs on the individual and the community, their cost-efficiency, and the challenges and solutions to program success.

Next is Pretrial Notification Protocols and Court Appearance Compliance. NIJ has a long history of criminal court research and court-based program evaluation, including a study on pretrial notification protocols. Failure to appear — also known as FTAs — for court hearings is a problem for law enforcement schedules to testify, the judge and the court staff and busy dockets, and so on. The repercussions for missed court hearings may also include warrants, violation of pretrial release, and other negative consequences for the defendant. Past research and notification protocols and compliance receive a lot of interest from a variety of courts dealing with similar problems, whether citations or misdemeanors or felony cases. NIJ is interested in research on the effectiveness and cost-efficiency of different protocols on reducing FTAs, and what case or defendant variables influence protocol success.

For Bail Reform, NIJ's history includes a long-standing interest in pretrial release and detention. Past expert planning meetings identified several concerns: risk assessment, public safety, community supervision, and related needs and issues. Over the last several years, states have considered legislation allowing more opportunities for conditional pretrial release based on assessments of FTA and/or public safety risks. Programs' goals include reducing pretrial detention and reserving monetary bail as a last resort. NIJ is interested in research that examines pretrial assessments and their success in predicting FTA, pretrial release violations, and new offenses. We're also interested in assessment

implementation. When are results used or overridden, and on what basis? And what are the effects on volume of conditional release versus monetary bail or detention? How do pretrial release conditions and supervision affect outcomes? And, finally, what is the cost-efficiency of assessment and other bail reform measures?

Next, we have Justice System-Led Strategies Aimed at Young-Adult Offenders. So, following an environmental scan of programs that target young adults — they're defined as age 18 to 24 — NIJ identified a need for research that more closely examines this group as high risk for arrest, incarceration, and recidivism. NIJ is interested in evaluation of research on Court-based and other Front-end Interventions, specifically their impact on recidivism and program cost-efficiency. The solicitation provides a link to the environmental scan, funded by NIJ, for more information. Please note that proposals to study post-disposition programs should be submitted to NIJ's other solicitation on "Research and Evaluation in Corrections."

Next is Investigation and Prosecutions, and specifically, we relate this to Body-Worn Cameras. This is another area where court and law enforcement interests overlap — the effects of body-worn cameras on criminal prosecution and case outcomes. Cases may range from domestic violence to other violent and criminal offenses. NIJ is interested in research on how information derived from cameras is used by prosecutors, how camera evidence strengthens/affects prosecutor decision-making, and how redaction and other video manipulation affect authenticity and other evidentiary concerns.

Finally, NIJ is interested in research that examines the influence of Juries on case outcomes in terms of individual cognition and group interaction. Some of the questions identified regard potential bias and detection via juror questionnaires, how jurors assess different types of evidence, influence of judicial instructions and juror comprehension, consideration of extralegal factors and perceived fairness of charges, and the process of jury consensus decisions.

Strong applications for research that address the administration of justice in the U.S. and the Department of Justice priorities may also be considered. Also, please review the guidance provided in the solicitation (around page 10) regarding randomized controlled trial designs and other research application considerations.

Next, we wanted to cover Expected Deliverables. Shown here are the lists of administrative and other grant requirements, including quarterly financial and semi-annual project updates. Details are provided in the solicitation, and special conditions with financial withholding are attached to grant awards. In addition to the research report and data deposit deliverables required for a public archive, NIJ expects the grantee to produce law review or scientific journal articles, trade journals, or other dissemination for practitioners, and similar work products during and after the grant period.

Next, we cover "what will not be funded," and this is in detail in the solicitation. We indicate the kinds of research or budget proposal that NIJ will not fund. As shown here, reasons include "nonresponsive to the solicitation" — primarily for equipment purchases without a

clear research justification, research already funded by another agency, and training or support unrelated to the proposed research.

Next are Recommended Resources. So, both during application preparation and after grant award, we recommend you reviewing some of the public documents that provide information on good practice relating to grant and budget management. The last one, NIJ Grants, directs you to a host of information, ranging from preparing your budget proposal to human subjects and privacy protection concerns.

I will now turn over the presentation to Brett, who will provide some helpful information on the application Review Process. Please do pay attention to the Selection Criteria and other guidance found in the solicitation as you prepare your application. And always try to put yourself in the shoes of the application reviewer. Brett ...

DR. BRETT CHAPMAN: Thank you, Linda. I just want to walk you through the Application Process. If you look at the solicitation, I'll just note, at the top, that there's plenty of information, from start to finish in that solicitation, that will give you an idea of what you need to consider, what you need to do, which you need to review as you're preparing your proposal for submission. On pages 43 and 44, you will see the Application Checklist, and we recommend that you look at these things to make sure that you're submitting everything that we require in the process. And that means to include SF-424, the Project Abstract, the Budget Worksheet and Narrative — those are separate documents — and the Indirect Cost Rates Agreement for your institution, any Tribal Authorization Resolutions if they apply, the Financial Management Questionnaire, and the Disclosure of Lobbying Activities. And I'll get into some of these documents in a minute.

So, continue with the Checklist. These are just a number of other things that should be included in the package that you submitted: curriculum vitae, résumé, the Research Evaluation Independence and Integrity Questionnaire. Some of these, you have to make sure (and I'll get into this in a minute) the specific documents are submitted on time or you will fail the BMR.

So, now, also in the solicitation, it will walk you through the Grants.gov process because that's where you will be submitting these proposals and what you want to do. Give yourself time. I cannot emphasize that enough. Do not wait until the last minute to get things like SAM — registration with SAM to get your DUNS number — or you will panic at the last minute and something is gonna fall apart and fall through the cracks. So, typically, people wait until that last minute to do a number of these things. You shouldn't do that.

Now, in terms of the Review Process, I want to mention first: the BMR. As the proposals, the packages come in, we are going to conduct what is called BMR to make sure that your package meets the bare minimum requirements, so these four documents are essential. If one or more of these documents is not included in your package, you will fail BMR, and your proposal will not receive any further consideration for funding. The Program Narrative, the Budget Detail Worksheet, the Budget Narrative and the CVs, résumés, or

biographical sketches are required at the time of the submission. Again, any one or more of these are not in the package, you will not be considered for funding.

Now, the Selection Criteria — now, don't be fooled by the percentages here because these are all equally important. Sure, we weight them a little differently in terms of score, but one thing we find is proposals tend to fall apart when these criteria do not align well in the proposal. So, the Statement of Problem and the Research questions. With the problem ... typically, we get proposals ... well, there's really no Problem. Someone must have researched something where there's no Problem. That's kind of a problem for us.

The Project Design and Implementation. Really, this is the meat of the proposal because here, you're telling us (1) what you're going to do and (2) how you plan to do it, so it's very important. That's where we assess the quality and technical merit of your proposal. What's the impact of your proposed research? Does it have any kind of implications for the criminal justice system? That's very important. Do you have capable and confident staff on the proposal? These things have to be documented and articulated well in your proposal so that we get a sense that the people on staff on the proposed project can do the work. And then the Budget and Dissemination plans. Although we do not score them, percentage-wise, they are very important.

Dissemination. Where are you proposing to, or how are you proposing to, disseminate this information? What vehicles, what outlets in the criminal justice system — whether it's the police chief, or ACA International [formerly American Collectors Association], or other relevant outlets. How are you gonna get this information out to the widest audience?

So, the Review Process: we have an external review and an internal review. We're gonna conduct the BMR, on every package that we get in, to make sure that you've met those basic minimum requirements and that your proposal can move on. Then, if you have met BMR, we will have your proposals reviewed by external peer reviewers — technical and practitioners. Then the review process moves internally to the scientific staff at NIJ; that includes myself and Dr. Truitt. Then it moves on to mid-level managers, other leadership, and the final decisions will rest with the NIJ Director.

So, these are a number of things that typically come up in the review process where applications do not do very well, and I really could save ourselves going through these by saying, “Details, details, details.” It's very important that you give us a sense of what you want to do and how you are going to do it. As Linda just said, put yourself in the shoes of the reviewer. They get this proposal — if it's 30 pages and they can't make any sense of it, it's going to fail. And these are some of the things we see where, for example, the proposal is vague. It doesn't really describe the date that it will be collected ... we may get things like that. That's not good for us because we can't tell whether you will be able to get the data that you're proposing to analyze. “The proposal failed to demonstrate significance of the proposed work.” Well, if there's really no significance in the work, we probably wouldn't fund it. “The proposal failed to demonstrate an understanding of potential pitfalls and limitations.” This is very important because we see that people promise all these things in the proposal. But they don't demonstrate an awareness of what happens if you

encounter certain pitfalls, or what are the limitations of your proposed research that could impact your funding. Too many details are missing; that happens commonly. We get these proposals where people spend a lot of time on things that are really unnecessary, and they miss the important details and they fail to include them in the proposal. “There's no impact for the criminal justice system in the real world.” And this happens a lot. You wouldn't believe this, but the proposal is typically disorganized and poorly written and lacks coherence. So those are not very good things if they come our way.

The Statement of the Problem fails to identify gaps in the literature, or in the Statement the literature review is insufficient. I've seen where you may get a proposal with a few cites and then that's it, where we know that there is much more literature to be articulated but sometimes potential applicants fail to demonstrate that, or the scope of the proposed research is extremely limited.

Turning to the Research Design, this is where you're going to score very highly or do very poorly. (1) If the design is not well articulated, that can be a problem, or the proposed research design and methods do not logically flow from the Statement of the Problem or the literature review. The proposed Research Questions are not derived from the literature review. Your proposed sample size should be supported by the appropriate power analysis. Sometimes, we get these sample sizes stating that $n = 100$, but there's no explanation on how the applicant came to that number. The feasibility of the protocol is not addressed in terms of access to the necessary qualitative or quantitative information, or the comparison group is biased in a systematic way.

Oftentimes, the Research Design may be too ambitious or too complex. The design is not clearly laid out. The sampling strategy may be flawed. And again, the quantitative analyses were vague and unclear. Applicants sometimes will say, “We propose to conduct a series of analyses” without giving us any additional information. So, again, our reviewer cannot ascertain whether your proposed research is valuable to the proposal because it's unclear what those designs or what these analyses may be. So, be very clear what those analyses are and what will benefit you well.

Competencies. Oftentimes, we'll get a PI who — it's not really clear that they can do the work. They may have significant experience in other areas, but they may lack it in policing, courts, corrections, or any area where they're submitting the proposal to, so that can be a problem. Or the PI may have limited experience in managing large-scale projects. Also, the research team has a limited track record of publishing scholarly research. Now, these are not necessarily damning, but they can cause you to lose points on your proposal. The Dissemination plan may lack specificity. (And that really should be in another section, by the way, but we'll keep it there for now.) And, as I said at the top, no criminology or criminal justice outlets are identified in the Dissemination plan.

So, I guess we are here at the Questions and Answers section. Do you have any questions? We can answer those. I haven't seen any pop up, and if you want to ask me questions, feel free to fire away.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: Actually, we do have one question. And it is, on page 15 of the solicitation, under “What will not be funded,” there is a bullet describing expenses related to equipment, materials, or supplies. Can you clarify and describe examples of what would versus would not be supported with the funding? (Linda touched on that earlier in the presentation.)

DR. BRETT CHAPMAN: Well, for example, if you proposed funding for a significant amount of money to go to technology but the technology is not well integrated in the proposed research, that could be one. There are any number of areas where your application which you are proposing would not be deemed allowable. I could go on all day with examples but, again, your research has to be well integrated, and any cost in terms of budget items had to be well integrated with the proposed research. I think that's about the best I can answer that question.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: There's another question. I think the nuts and bolts of it is, as a first-year Ph.D. student, are they eligible to apply? (If the person that asked that question ... as I'm not getting to your full question, please submit clarification, but I believe that's what you're asking.) “As a Ph.D. student and a first-year, am I eligible to apply?”

DR. BRETT CHAPMAN: Not under this solicitation. I think the Graduate Research Fellowship would probably be a more appropriate solicitation for you to apply under, in the future, because that one is now closed. So that's one. You might want to check — you can actually go to our website, www.ojp.nij.gov. Although it's not open, you can look at expired solicitations, and it will pull up the one that we most recently released and that will give you a lot of information in terms of how you would apply to that as a Ph.D. student.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: All right. And we do have a few other questions that came through. “How will junior scholars in their early stage who do not have very much experience in managing large grants be treated differently, for example, an assistant professor who just started a tenure-track position?”

DR. LINDA TRUITT: So, one of the things that you will notice in our solicitation this fiscal year regards the question of New Investigator/ Early Career, and so that is addressed on page 11 of this solicitation. And what we're doing is encouraging those who are, I think, in that sort of situation where they don't have a long history of publications and other work. And spelled out here are some of the Eligibility requirements, if you will. So, you hold the non-tenure assistant professor appointment, your terminal degree is within the past 10 years, and you have not received NIJ funding as a PI in a research project with the exception of a couple of solicitations like the GRF, Graduate Research Fellowships. So, that is something that we are encouraging. And we can't say too much about how that will factor in. We don't have a specific weighting or other way. We are just saying that they should identify it as such, preferably in a title page of the application. And then NIJ will be able to consider that in the funding decision-making.

DR. BRETT CHAPMAN: Yeah. And that you're not treated differently per se. Again, if you consider the Selection Criteria, it's judged based on what you bring to the table in that

proposal. So, it's an even playing field — and I don't think you're suggesting anything else — everyone is judged the same, but people just bring different experiences and the quality of the proposals are different as they come in. And that's, in part, what the final decisions are based on.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: Another question: “Are we allowed to submit proposals that overlap in two of the areas identified in the RFP, say, eyewitness and jury decision-making? Would this have any impact on the likelihood of getting funded?”

DR. BRETT CHAPMAN: No, it wouldn't ... oh, let me rephrase. Not necessarily, as long as you can show how those two proposals differ. Because if they're very much the same, that could have an impact, possibly.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: I think they want one proposal that touches both.

DR. BRETT CHAPMAN: Sure. That's fine.

DR. LINDA TRUITT: Yeah, so they're not mutually exclusive.

DR. BRETT CHAPMAN: Right.

DR. LINDA TRUITT: So these are priority interest areas that NIJ has identified that are consistent with the Administration and Department's priorities. They are meant to convey what we think are very important matters and are ready for rigorous research. There's no reason that you can't combine one or more of those. Again, as Brett was describing, just be really careful about how you set that up, and make sure that if you are covering multiple areas, you have adequate resources to do that.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: “For New Investigator/ Early Career opportunities, the solicitation says they must have completed their terminal degree. Is terminal degree only a doctoral level degree, i.e., a master's level does not apply?”

DR. LINDA TRUITT: The ruling has been, if you are in a line of discipline where the natural termination of your education ... so, for example, a juris doctorate. So, it's your law degree; it could be the terminal degree in your career progression. You could argue — given your discipline of study and, relevantly, this application research — that you are at that point where you've reached the terminal point of your education. And if that's a master's degree, you will simply make that point. I think there's a couple of examples like that, that had to do with medical school, clinical positions, and that sort of thing. So, just be very careful, making that crystal clear to the reviewer.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: Another question. “If you apply for a particular solicitation and do not receive it, can you apply for other solicitations as they become available with the same proposal?”

DR. BRETT CHAPMAN: If you don't receive funding — you said “receive it,” but are you saying ...? Again, you have to be very careful because if you apply to another solicitation, you have to make sure it's responsive to that solicitation. There could be some overlap, but we want these proposals to be responsive to our solicitation. So, if it's responsive to another solicitation, nothing would prevent you from submitting to that solicitation.

DR. LINDA TRUITT: Right. So, particularly, if it's this fiscal year, and you're talking about this array of solicitation funding opportunities, you want each solicitation application to be very specific and targeted. What we cannot do is taking an application and molding it around the solicitation. It's really up to you to be specific as to what your target is and the rationale for applying it to that. It doesn't count against you, but it's probably a good idea if you do decide to do that. If you know it now, put it in the first one. If you know it by the second one, make a note of that. So you're acknowledging it, and if we're aware of that, it makes it a little bit easier.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: At this time, I do not see any other questions. We'll give everyone a few minutes. Just to let you know, I did change the slide. There's some contact information showing right now. It is for the National Criminal Justice Reference Service and their Response Center. You'll see a toll-free number, email, fax, number, web chat, and you can submit any questions you have after this webinar to NCJRS, and they will respond to you. If they have to, they will contact Brett and Linda, and get an answer back to you.

Also, as a reminder, these slides and the transcript for this webinar will be posted or attached to the NIJ solicitation in approximately 10 business days.

Another question came through. “Would a law enforcement agency be considered a researcher?”

DR. BRETT CHAPMAN: Yes. And that's my area, so I love to get those kind of questions. Again, it's going ... the research is what's key, so nothing would prevent a law enforcement agency from submitting a proposal. Again, we're going to judge what we have on paper and the quality of that research being proposed, so whether you're from a law enforcement agency does not matter. We're thinking of the quality of the proposal, so we welcome those proposals.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: “Last year, NIJ was accepting open submissions for early-career investigator awards. This appears to be different. Will NIJ go back to the previously opened submission, or is this how this award will be considered in the future as part of the RFP?”

DR. LINDA TRUITT: So, yes, correct. In FY17 and before, there was a dedicated solicitation for New Investigator/ Early Career research. As you could see now, looking at the FY18 solicitations, there is a section in each of them about this consideration; all of the

solicitations had been released. You should not be seeing another open-ended New Investigator solicitation that would be apart from these.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: “Is the funding applicable for only existing interventions, front-end interventions, or can it be used to evaluate the impact of a novel or innovative intervention?”

DR. BRETT CHAPMAN: I don't think there's any restriction on what you're proposing — again, to the extent that it responds to the RFP. So, whether it's novel or whether it's an existing [intervention], I don't think anything would prevent you from applying.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: “Will it be difficult to receive funding for quasi-experimental research versus research with random assignments?”

DR. BRETT CHAPMAN: No, not difficult. Look, our Director is a big fan of randomized controlled trials, and he has made that very clear, but I don't think that if you submit a different proposal, you automatically will be shot down, so I would not say that. I would not jump to that conclusion but, again, our Director has gone on record as being a fan of RCTs, so, no. But, if it's difficult — I don't want to use those words, “would it be difficult.” You would be judged accordingly and — similarly to all the other proposals that we receive or would receive — the ones that are considered to be the strongest ones would be the ones that have the highest probability of receiving funding.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: All right. Somebody is asking a clarifying question from an earlier question, obviously. “If we have research plans — if you have research plans in one or more areas under the proposal, are you accepting multiple solicitations from the same PI? I'm assuming that these would be totally different. Different topic, but the same person submitting them.”

DR. BRETT CHAPMAN: Again, nothing would prevent someone from submitting multiple proposals. Let's say, hypothetically, if that person rose to the top, then of course it becomes ... there's a management issue there, because if you applied for, let's say, four proposals and you looked favorable across all four, then the question becomes, “Can you manage all four where you do receive funding?” But nothing in the RFP would prevent one PI to submit multiple proposals. We get that a lot of times across solicitations.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: “Are all proposals that intersect one of the solicitation's stated interests in a different area of the justice system — example, family law, immigration law — acceptable?”

DR. BRETT CHAPMAN: Yes. I think the best answer I could give you there is yes, you can submit it. And again, the extent of which it receives additional funding consideration will depend, in large part, on the substance contained therein. So, I can't say you couldn't submit it, but if another proposal is responsive to the Administration's interest and their

goals and their priorities, then you would receive consideration — review consideration and then, hopefully, funding consideration.

DR. LINDA TRUITT: Thank you all for taking the time to join us today. As we're showing here, you can always get a transcript and the slides. Submit any questions you have outstanding to NCJRS and they'll get those to us. And I think that's about all.

DR. BRETT CHAPMAN: Yeah, thank you for joining. We hope that we were helpful in moving you along to submitting your proposals. We look forward to seeing some good proposals and reviewing them, and spending some money! So, we thank you, and have a good afternoon.

Funding Opportunities through NIJ for the Administration of Justice, Fiscal Year 2018

April 4, 2018 | TIME 3:00 PM EST

The webinar will begin shortly.



NIJ

Important Information for Today's Webinar

- **Live-captioning** is available for the hearing impaired. Please click on the “Media Viewer” to log in.
- **Difficulty hearing via your computer?** Click on “Communicate” at the top left, and then “Audio Connection” to adjust the speakers. Still can't hear? Dial in using the information located in the meeting invite.
- **Need technical assistance?** Please use the [Chat Box](#), and send your issue to the Host.
- **Questions about the presentation?** Submit questions at any time by **using the Q&A box and selecting all panelists**. Questions will be answered at the end of the presentation.
- A transcript of this presentation, and the related slides will be posted to the NIJ website.



NIJ

Funding Opportunities through NIJ for the Research and Evaluation on the Administration of Justice, Fiscal Year 2018

Solicitation: NIJ-2018-14001

Solicitation Post Date: March 16, 2018

Solicitation Close Date: May 14, 2018 11:59 PM EDT

Today's Presenters:

Brett Chapman, Social Science Analyst and Linda Truitt, Senior Social Science Analyst
Office of Research and Evaluation



NIJ

Webinar Overview

- Goals of the Research and Evaluation on the Administration of Justice solicitation
- Topic Areas of Interest
- Expected Deliverables
- Recommended Resources
- Application Process
- Review Process & Selection Criteria
- Common Panel Criticisms
- Q&A Session



Goals of Research and Evaluation on the Administration of Justice solicitation

This solicitation supports the U.S. Department of Justice's priorities of reducing violent crime and enhancing investigations and prosecutions.

This solicitation seeks investigator-initiated, interdisciplinary research and evaluation projects related to the administration of justice in three areas: (1) eyewitness evidence; (2) front-end intervention strategies; and (3) enhancing investigations and prosecutions.

Topic Areas of Interest

- Eyewitness Identification Evidence
 - Cognitive Neuroscience
 - Research on Estimator and System Variables
- Front-end Intervention Strategies
 - Diversion and Deflection Programs
 - Pretrial Notification Protocols and Court Appearance Compliance
 - Bail Reform
 - Justice System-Led Strategies Aimed at Young-Adult Offenders
- Enhancing Investigations and Prosecutions
 - Body-Worn Cameras
 - Research on Juror Decision-Making



Expected Deliverables

- **Standard grant reporting requirements**
 - Quarterly and final financial reports
 - Semi-annual research performance progress reports
- **Final Research Report**
- **Associated data sets or files, if appropriate**
- **Community and scholarly products**
 - Peer-reviewed journal articles
 - Presentations to appropriate scientific and practitioner conferences



What will not be funded

- Applications...
 - that are not responsive to this specific solicitation
 - whose primary purpose is to purchase equipment, materials, or supplies*
 - whose work is funded under another federal award
 - that request training in support of programs or direct services unrelated to or associated with the proposed project
 - that request programs or services unrelated to the scope of the project or existing programs or services being evaluated

* However: “A budget may include these items for consideration if they are necessary to conduct research, development, demonstration, evaluation, or analysis.”



Recommended Resources

- **OJP Funding Resource Center**
 - <https://ojp.gov/funding/index.htm>
- **DOJ Grants Financial Guide**
 - <https://ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/index.htm>
- **DOJ Grants Financial Management Online Training**
 - <https://ojpfgm.webfirst.com/>
- **NIJ Grants**
 - <https://www.nij.gov/funding/pages/welcome.aspx>



NIJ

APPLICATION PROCESS



NIJ

Application Checklist | Requirements

– See pages **43-44** of the solicitation

- What an Application Should Include:

- Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424)
- Project Abstract
- Program Narrative (critical element)
- Budget Detail Worksheet & Narrative (critical elements)
- Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable)
- Tribal Authorizing Resolution or Executive Order
- Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire
- Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL)



Application Checklist | Requirements

– See pages **43-44** of the solicitation

- Additional Attachments

- Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications
- Curriculum vitae or resume (critical element)
- Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity
- Request and Justification for Employee Compensation; Waiver (if applicable)
- Complete list of the individuals named or otherwise identified anywhere in the application



NIJ

Application Submission

- Grants.gov

- Register in advance of deadline
- Acquire a unique entity identifier (currently, a DUNS number).
- Acquire or maintain registration with SAM
- Submit application packet at least 72 hours prior to deadline

- Mandatory and Optional Attachments
 - Files labeled to describe the file being attached (e.g., program narrative, budget narrative, CVs or résumés, etc.)



REVIEW PROCESS



NIJ

Basic Minimum Requirements

1. Program narrative
2. Budget detail worksheet
3. Budget narrative
4. CVs, résumés, or biographical sketches of key personnel



Selection Criteria

- **Statement of the Problem and Research Questions** - 10%
 - Understanding of the problem, research questions, and their importance
- **Project Design and Implementation** - 50%
 - Quality and technical merit
- **Potential Impact** - 20%
 - Ability to change a stated criminal justice problem
- **Capabilities/Competencies** - 20%
 - Demonstrated productivity, and experience of the applicant organization and proposed project staff
- **Budget**
- **Dissemination plans**

External and Internal Review

- **BMR/Responsiveness Review**
 - Submitted by an eligible applicant
 - Responsive to the scope of the solicitation
 - Basic Minimum Requirements included
- **External Peer Reviewer**
 - Technical and practitioner reviewers
- **Internal Review**
 - NIJ scientific staff and leadership
 - Department subject matter experts
- **All funding decisions are at the discretion of the NIJ Director**

Critiques Raised During Peer Review Process

- **Overall Problems in Applications**

- The proposal vaguely describes how the data will be collected and analyzed.
- Proposal fails to demonstrate the significance of the proposed work.
- The proposal failed to demonstrate an understanding of the potential pitfalls and limitations of the proposed research.
- Too many details in the proposal are missing.
- The proposal fails to demonstrate how it will impact criminal justice policy and practice in the real world.
- Proposal is disorganized in its presentation, poorly written or lacked coherence.



Critiques Raised During Peer Review Process

- **Statement of the Problem**

- Statement fails to identify gaps in the current literature.
- The literature review is insufficient.
- The scope of the proposed research is extremely limited.



Critiques Raised During Peer Review Process

- **Research Design**
 - The overall research design is not well articulated.
 - The proposed research design/methods approach does not logically flow from the problem statement and literature review.
 - The proposed research questions are not derived from the literature review.
 - The proposed sample size should be supported by a power analysis.
 - The feasibility of the proposed protocol is not addressed, in terms of access to the necessary qualitative and quantitative information.
 - The comparison group is biased in a systematic way.



Critiques Raised During Peer Review Process

- **Research Design (continued)**
 - The research design is too ambitious and too complex.
 - The proposed research design is not clearly laid out.
 - The proposed sampling strategy is flawed.
 - The proposed quantitative analyses are vague and unclear.



Critiques Raised During Peer Review Process

- **Capabilities and Competencies**

- The Principal Investigator (PI) does not demonstrate familiarity or proficiency with the proposed quantitative analysis.
- The information provided is too limited to suggest that the PI can manage research projects.
- The research team has a limited track record of publishing scholarly research.
- The dissemination plan lacks specificity and/or is not innovative.
- No criminology/criminal justice outlets are identified in the dissemination plan.





QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

DISCUSSION



NIJ

Contact Information

National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) Response Center

Toll-free +1 (800) 851-3420

TTY +1 (301) 240-6310 for hearing impaired only

Email Grants@ncjrs.gov

Fax +1 (301) 240-5830

Web chat <https://webcontact.ncjrs.gov/ncjchat/chat.jsp>

NIJ FAQs <https://www.nij.gov/funding/Pages/faqs.aspx>



NIJ

Thank You!



NIJ