Notices regarding the solicitation "Research and Evaluation on Policing"

<u>April 3, 2019</u>: On March 20, 2019, NIJ hosted a webinar which included an overview and discussion on this funding opportunity. The slides and transcript from this webinar have been added to the end of this solicitation document.

<u>February 25, 2019</u>: The link to the DOJ Grants Financial Management Online Training under "Financial Management and System of Internal Controls" was updated.

<u>February 19, 2019</u>: Information regarding submission of information pertaining to disclosure and justification for DOJ High Risk Grantees 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 for research projects employing randomized control trials (RCTs) to develop evidence-based knowledge in policing. This program furthers the Department's mission by sponsoring research to provide objective, independent, evidence-based knowledge and tools to meet the challenges of policing, particularly at the State, local, and tribal levels*.

Research and Evaluation on Policing

Applications Due: May 7, 2019

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),[1] 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.

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)[2]. 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.

NIJ may elect to fund applications submitted under this FY 2019 solicitation in future fiscal years, dependent on, among other considerations, the merit of the applications and on the availability of appropriations.

---

[1] A determination by the Secretary of the Interior is not required for tribes to which federal recognition was extended by virtue of Public Law 115-121, the Thomasina E. Jordan Indian Tribes of Virginia Federal Recognition Act of 2017.
[2] For additional information on subawards, see "Budget and Associated Documentation" under [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#).

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 7, 2019.

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-2019-15543

Release date: February 7, 2019

Contents

Research and Evaluation on Policing

(CFDA No. 16.560)

A. Program Description

Overview

With this solicitation, NIJ seeks applications for funding for investigator-initiated, randomized controlled trial (RCT) studies of approaches to the challenges of policing in the United States that address the strategic priorities and objectives identified in NIJ's *Policing Strategic Research Plan, 2017-2022*. Applicants are required to identify the strategic priority and relevant objective(s) that their proposal addresses on the title page of their application's program narrative. Applications that do not address the priorities and objectives of NIJ's *Policing Strategic Research Plan 2017-2022* will not be considered for funding. Among other areas of interest, NIJ is interested in RCT studies examining the approaches to the challenges of policing in rural communities.

This solicitation supports the U.S. Department of Justice priorities to reduce crime, protect, and support law enforcement, and to support prosecutors.

Applications proposing research involving partnerships with criminal justice or other agencies, are to include a strong letter of support, signed by an appropriate decision-making authority from each proposed partnering agency. A letter of support must include the partnering agency's acknowledgement that de-identified data provided through this project will be archived by the awardee in the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data (NACJD) at the conclusion of the award (see Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products, below). If selected for award, applicants will be expected to have a formal agreement in place with partnering agencies by January 1, 2020. That agreement must include provisions to meet the data archiving requirements of the award. In rare circumstances, for example, where a law may place restrictions on the archiving of agency data, NIJ may agree to a successful applicant creating and archiving an appropriate synthetic dataset. Those circumstances will be rare, decided by NIJ on a case-by-case basis, and will require extensive documentation and justification for exceptions to be made.

In addition, in the case of partnerships that will involve the use of federal award funds by multiple partnering agencies to carry out the proposed project, only one entity/partnering agency may be the applicant (as is the case with any application submitted in response to this solicitation); any others must be proposed as subrecipients.

Statutory Authority: Any awards under this solicitation would be made under statutory authority provided by a full-year appropriations act for FY 2019. 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 2019.

Program-Specific Information

Randomized control trials (RCTs) are a powerful tool for developing scientific evidence about what works. Of the 61 policing programs reported to be effective or promising in

CrimeSolutions.gov, only eight were evaluated with an RCT. This solicitation is intended to remedy that dearth by supporting RCT studies of a policing practice, strategy, program (to include training and education, recruitment, retention, and workforce development), or forensic innovation that address the strategic priorities and objectives identified in NIJ's *Policing Strategic Research Plan, 2017-2022*.

The NIJ *Policing Strategic Research Plan, 2017 – 2022* identifies three strategic priorities:

I. Promote and Support Research to Optimize Workforce Development for Officers and Civilian Personnel.

This strategic priority represents NIJ's commitment to support research that will identify challenges and promote promising practices that will advance the policing workforce. This includes both sworn, and civilian personnel, and those in support agencies including publicly-funded forensic crime laboratories, medical examiner and coroner offices, and police forensic units; to include crime scene personnel and medicolegal death investigators. Research areas under this strategic priority include but are not limited to:

- Recruitment, retention, and workforce development;

- Training and education, including the composition of an evidence-based curricula; and

- Training technologies designed to enhance performance.

II. Promote and Support Research on Policing Practices.

This strategic priority supports NIJ's efforts that focus on advancing policing practices and strategies deployed by police organizations. Research areas under this strategic priority include but are not limited to:

- Person- or place-based practices and strategies intended to deter, disrupt, or prevent crime;

- Patrol practices;

- The application and timeliness of data and outputs from forensic science examinations, technologies, and innovations to support police investigations and systems-based strategies;[3]

- System and organizational characteristics that advance police performance;

- Officer decision-making practices;

---

[3] While NIJ has supported research on the impact of forensic innovations on court outcomes and on methods to improve forensic processing efficiencies, the actual impact of forensic innovations on police-practices and outcomes has received relatively less attention. See NIJ Understanding the Impact of the Forensic Sciences on the Criminal Justice System. https://www.nij.gov/topics/forensics/Pages/social-science.aspx; NIJ Research and Evaluation in Publicly Funded Forensic Laboratories. https://www.nij.gov/topics/forensics/lab-operations/pages/public-labs-research-solicitation.aspx.

- The adoption of technology that assists in organizational performance; and

- Partnerships among police organizations or between police practitioners and researchers.

III. Promote and Support Research on the Relationship between Policing and Communities.

This strategic priority furthers NIJ's commitment to support research to enhance police-community relationships. Research areas under this strategic priority include but are not limited to:

- Police-community engagement strategies;

- Emerging technologies to enhance police-citizen communications;

- Strategies that strengthen trust and confidence between police and community residents; and

- Individual and community characteristics that affect the delivery of policing services.

General Guidance

Applicants should provide a compelling justification that the policing practice, strategy, program, or forensic innovation is suitable for evaluation, and that the initiatives associated with it are promising. Evidence supporting the selected policing strategy, practice, or program should meet at least one of the following criteria:

- Referenced in NIJ's web-based clearinghouse of strategies, programs, and practices,[4] Crimesolutions.gov, as promising or effective;

- Cited in empirical literature on policing;

- Implemented abroad and logically applied to U.S. populations.

NIJ will consider single- and multi-site evaluations of policing practices, strategies, or programs. In both instances, sufficient power and the generation of generalizable knowledge are imperative. If a multi-site evaluation is proposed, applicants should submit research designs that include both pooled and site-specific outcome analyses. In addition, applicants should account for any program deviations in the outcome analysis. Applications should include Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) or letters-of-support from participating police agencies.

RCT Evaluation Considerations

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

---

[4] Other web-based sources of program evaluations could include George Mason University's Center for Evidence-based Crime Policy; the Campbell Collaboration; the MacArthur Foundation; or, the Arnold Foundation.

administrative data that are already being collected, or implementing an intervention into a program already funded.

Applicants are strongly encouraged to include the following information in the Project Narrative of their application:

1. A description of the policing intervention program model with fidelity benchmarks of implementation activities. Applicants should describe likely model adaptions that may be needed at proposed evaluation sites. A discussion of how these adaptations may impact model fidelity should be included. If a multi-site evaluation is proposed, applicants should indicate how consistent implementation fidelity will be achieved.

2. An explanation of the theory of change behind the model activities. Applicants should clearly describe how proposed project activities contribute to the expected policing outcomes, such as crime reductions or officer performance. The narrative should identify the data to be collected, the availability of the data, and how the data will be used to measure activities and outcomes.

3. The logic model of the evaluation. The logic model should include the randomization plan that will outline how the participants will be identified and randomized into either the treatment group(s) or control group(s). The randomization plan should also include a description of the treatment condition relative to the existing business-as-usual practice assigned to the control group.

4. A power analysis. Applicants should connect the power analysis to anticipated effect sizes necessary to detect a difference in the treatment and control groups based on the services the control group will receive. If a multi-site evaluation is proposed, applicants should include pooled and site-specific calculations in their power analysis.

5. A discussion of plausible sources of contamination in the evaluation design and proposed methods to mitigate contamination.

6. A robust site description. At a minimum, this should include a description of all training and technical assistance (TTA) the site(s) has/have received, or will receive during the course of the evaluation, and the vendor supplying the TTA.

Encouraging Program Investments in Economically-Distressed Communities (Qualified Opportunity Zones)

Under this program, OJP will, as appropriate, give priority consideration in award decisions to applications that propose projects that directly benefit federally designated Qualified Opportunity Zones (QOZ).[5] In order to assist NIJ in considering this factor, applicants should include information in the application that specifies how the project will generate information about enhancing public safety in the specified QOZs. For resources on QOZs, and for a current list of designated QOZs, see the U.S. Department of the Treasury's resource webpage, accessible at https://www.cdfifund.gov/pages/opportunity-zones.aspx.

---

[5] See Public Law 115-97, Title I, Subtitle C, Part IX, Subpart B, Sec. 13823.

Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products

The ultimate goal of this solicitation is to develop evidence-based knowledge to advance police operations and practices to deliver policing services to communities more effectively and efficiently at the State, local, and tribal levels.

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 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 for an overview of performance measurement activities at OJP.

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
Conduct research in social and behavioral sciences having clear implications for criminal justice policy and practice in the United States. Conduct research in science, technology, engineering, and/or mathematics having clear implications for criminal justice policy and practice in the United States.	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.	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

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.

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 anticipates at least $3 million will be available to fund multiple grant awards of which up to $500,000 will be available for relevant research involving federally recognized tribes (or tribally based organizations). Successful applicants will be expected to complete the work proposed within a five-year period of performance.

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, 2020.

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 2019, 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's decisions regarding future funding for applications only partially funded in FY 2019, 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 to make any award under this solicitation in the form of a grant. See Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements, under Section F. Federal Award Administration Information, for a brief discussion of important statutes, regulations, and award conditions that apply to many (or in some cases, all) OJP grants.

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 entities[6]) must, as described in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements[7] 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

---

[6] 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.
[7] 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://onlinegfmt.training.ojp.gov/. (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.

- Applications that do not propose the use of a randomized controlled trial.

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.[8] The 2019 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/19Tables/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.

---

[8] 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.

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, 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, current 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 the application (e.g., articles of incorporation, 501(c)(3) status documentation, organizational letterhead) 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.[9]

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

---

[9] 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.

application number of the previous application, and (2) a brief summary of revisions to the application, including responses to previous feedback received from NIJ.

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 program-specific information on page 4 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:

- o Experience and capacity to work with the proposed data sources in the conduct of similar research efforts.

- o Experience and capacity to design and implement rigorous research and data analysis projects.

- o 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). **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).

- 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 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 on or 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 <u>all</u> 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 $250,000)[10]**

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, $250,000 -- 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 $250,000 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 $250,000) 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 $250,000 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:

---

[10] Consistent with the provisions of Office of Management and Budget memorandum, OMB M-18-18, dated June 20, 2018, and entitled, "Implementing Statutory Changes to the Micro-Purchase and the Simplified Acquisition Thresholds for Financial Assistance," DOJ will allow recipients (and any subrecipients) of awards made under this solicitation to use a simplified acquisition threshold of $250,000 and a micro-purchase threshold of $10,000, for federal grants administrative purposes.

(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 the "de minimis" rate requirements (including information on eligibility to elect to use the rate), see the Part 200 Uniform Requirements, at 2 C.F.R. 200.414(f).

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 applications[11]

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).

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 Office)	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.

---

[11] 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.

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. Applicant Disclosure and Justification – DOJ High Risk Grantees[12] (if applicable)

An applicant that is designated as a DOJ High Risk Grantee is to submit ███████, as a separate attachment to its application, information that OJP will use, among other pertinent information, to determine whether it will consider or select the application for an award under this solicitation. The file should be named "DOJ High Risk Grantee Applicant Disclosure and Justification." (See, also, "Review Process," below, under Section E. Application Review Information, for a brief discussion of how such information may considered in the application review process.)

OJP constantly seeks to optimize its investments in criminal- and juvenile justice-focused programs and activities, increase program effectiveness, and maximize the return – and program impact – from limited programmatic resources. Therefore, OJP may remove from consideration or not select for award a "DOJ High Risk Grantee" applicant that is determined to pose a substantial risk of program implementation failure. In making such determinations, OJP will consider one or more of the following factors: the applicant's lack of sufficient progress in addressing required corrective actions necessary for removal of the DOJ High Risk Grantee designation; the nature and severity of the issues leading to or accompanying the applicant's DOJ High Risk Grantee designation; or the applicant's expected ability to manage grant funds and achieve grant goals and objectives.

In this attachment, the applicant is to provide any additional information or justification – especially with regard to corrective actions yet to be implemented (as of the application date) – that may help demonstrate how the applicant has addressed or otherwise mitigated such uncorrected matters, such that any negative impact on the proposed program and its implementation would be immaterial or would be significantly reduced or eliminated. (To the extent that the applicant believes that any of the information provided pursuant to this disclosure may be confidential in nature, the applicant should specifically identify it.)

c. 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

---

[12] A "DOJ High Risk Grantee" is a recipient that has received a DOJ High-Risk designation based on a documented history of unsatisfactory performance, financial instability, management system or other internal control deficiencies, or noncompliance with award terms and conditions on prior awards, or that is otherwise not responsible.

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.

d. Documentation of Anticipated Benefit to Qualified Opportunity Zones (if applicable)

As is mentioned above, OJP will give priority consideration in award decisions to applications that propose projects that will generate information about enhancing public safety federally designated Qualified Opportunity Zones (QOZ). Each applicant proposing a project it anticipates will generate information about enhancing public safety in one or more QOZs should provide a sufficient narrative explanation in order for OJP to identify clearly the public safety benefit the applicant anticipates that information generated under its project will have on a specified QOZ(s). The attachment(s) should be clearly labeled as addressing QOZs. The applicant may also include tables, charts, graphs, or other relevant illustrations that may be useful in comprehending the manner in which the proposed project is anticipated to benefit a QOZ(s).

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.

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.

An applicant must use the **Add Attachment** button to attach a file to its application. Do not click the paperclip icon to attach files. This action will not attach the files to the application. After adding an attachment, select the **View Attachment** button to confirm you attached the correct file. To remove the file, select the **Delete Attachment** button.

An application can be checked for errors via the **Check Application** button on the **Forms** tab of the **Manage Workspace** page. The button is active if the set of forms in the workspace matches those required in the application package. If you receive a **Cross-Form Errors** message after clicking the **Check Application** button, refer to the Cross-Form Errors help article for more detailed information about this validation error.

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/IndCPRegister 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 https://www.dnb.com. A DUNS number is usually received within 2 business days.

2. **Acquire or maintain registration with SAM.** Any applicant for an OJP award creating a new entity registration (or updating or renewing a registration) in SAM.gov must submit an original, signed notarized letter appointing the authorized Entity Administrator within thirty (30) days of the registration activation. **Notarized letters must be submitted via U.S. Postal Service Mail.** Read the Alert at sam.gov/SAM/ to learn more about what is required in the notarized letter, and read the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) at www.gsa.gov/samupdate to learn more about this process change. 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). Information about SAM registration procedures can be accessed at sam.gov/SAM/.

   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.

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. 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 and the funding opportunity number is NIJ-2019-15543.

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.** To preview the application prior to (or after) submitting, go to the **View Application** tab in Workspace. For additional information, review the View Application Tab help article and Attachments Tab help article.

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 7, 2019.

Go to 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 at https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/support.html or the SAM Help Desk (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 20 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) – 20%

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) – 10%

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 application, if submitted by an applicant that is a DOJ High Risk Grantee,[13] or is designated "high risk" by a federal grant-making agency outside of DOJ, must not have been determined by the Director/Administrator to pose a substantial risk of program implementation failure, based on 1) the applicant's lack of sufficient progress in addressing required corrective actions necessary for removal of the DOJ High Risk Grantee (or non-DOJ high risk) designation, 2) the nature and severity of the issues leading to or accompanying the DOJ High Risk Grantee (or non-DOJ high risk) designation, and/or 3) the applicant's expected ability to manage grant funds and achieve grant goals and objectives.

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 internal reviewer is a current DOJ employee who is well-versed or has expertise in the subject matter of this solicitation. An external peer reviewer is an expert in the subject matter of a given solicitation who is not a current DOJ employee. 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 (specifically including, but not limited to, demonstrable potential enhancement to public safety in one or more federally designated Qualified Opportunity Zones), 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 $250,000 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; "FAPIIS").

---

[13] See "Applicant Disclosure and Justification – DOJ High Risk Grantees" under "What an Application Should Include," above, for a definition of "DOJ High Risk Grantee."

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

Note on applicants with a "high risk" designation: Risks associated with DOJ High Risk Grantees, or applicants designated as "high risk" by a federal grant-making agency outside of DOJ, are taken into account during the review process, and each applicant with such "high risk" designations will be considered for funding on a case-by-case basis, depending on the nature and severity of the issues that led to the DOJ High Risk Grantee (or non-DOJ high risk) designation, status of progress in addressing corrective actions, and expected ability to manage grant funds and achieve grant goals and objectives. A "high risk" designated applicant is to submit disclosure and justification documentation consistent with the requirements specified, above, under "What an Application Should Include" in Section D. Application and Submission Information.

All final award decisions 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.

F. Federal Award Administration Information

Federal Award Notices

Award notifications will be made by September 30, 2019. 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 a physical signature on the award document by the authorized representative. The fully-executed award document must then be scanned and submitted 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 2019. 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 cooperative agreement. Cooperative agreements 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 the requires specific reporting in connection with conferences, meetings, retreats, seminars, symposium, training activities, or similar events funded under the award.

Awards under this solicitation will include a condition (the specific terms of which will govern the award) related to verification of employment eligibility. The condition will, generally speaking, require the recipient (and any subrecipient) that accepts the award to verify the employment eligibility of any individual hired under the award, consonant with 8 U.S.C. § 1324a(1).

Awards under this solicitation will include a condition (the specific terms of which will govern the award) related to competition requirements set forth at 2 C.F.R. § 200.319. The condition will, generally speaking, prohibit recipients (and any subrecipients) from procuring goods and services with award funds by means of any competition that disadvantages or excludes vendors on the basis of their having (or their having had) a prior or existing contractual relationship with the federal government.

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 for an overview of performance measurement activities at OJP.

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 ojpprsupport@usdoj.gov. (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 Policing

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 30)
_____ Acquire or renew registration with SAM   (see page 31)
To Register with Grants.gov:
_____ Acquire AOR and Grants.gov username/password   (see page 31)
_____ Acquire AOR confirmation from the E-Biz POC   (see page 31)
To Find Funding Opportunity:
_____ Search for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov   (see page 31)
_____ Access Funding Opportunity and Application Package   (see page 31)
_____ Sign up for Grants.gov email notifications (optional)   (see page 29)
_____ 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 13)
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 31)
If no Grants.gov receipt, and validation or error notifications are received:
_____ Contact NIJ regarding experiencing technical difficulties   (see page 2)

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 14)
_____ Curriculum vitae or resume (critical element)   (see page 14)
_____ Project Abstract (if applicable)   (see page 14)
_____ Program Narrative   (see page 15)
_____ Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative   (see page 19)
_____ Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable)   (see page 19)
_____ Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable)   (see page 23)
_____ Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire   (see page 23)

_____ [Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL)](#)   (see page 24)
_____ Additional Attachments
          _____ Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications (see page 25)
          _____ Applicant Disclosure and Justification – DOJ High Risk Grantees (if applicable)
                    (see page 26)
          _____ Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity   (see page 26)
_____ Request and Justification for Employee Compensation; Waiver (if applicable)
          (see page 13)
_____ Documentation of Anticipated Benefit to federally designated Qualified Opportunity
          Zones (if applicable)   (see page 28)

Funding Webinar Transcript

On March 20, 2019, NIJ hosted a webinar that provided an overview of this solicitation. Following are the transcript and slide presentation from that webinar.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: Good afternoon everybody and welcome to today's webinar, Research and Evaluation on Policing, hosted by the National Institute of Justice. So at this time, I would like to turn it over and introduce you to our presenters, Dr. Brett Chapman, Social Science Analyst; Eric Martin, Social Science Analyst with the Office of Research and Evaluation; and Dr. Joel Hunt, Senior Computer Scientist with the Officer of Science and Technology within the National Institute of Justice.

ERIC MARTIN: Thank you, Mary Jo. My name is Eric Martin and I'm gonna be one of the presenters for this webinar. To begin with, we're going to--I'll give you a brief overview of what we're going to discuss. One, what this webinar will not cover, but don't worry, we're going to give you--point you in the direction to get that information that we're not covering. We're going to discuss and present our Review Process & Selection Criteria that we use to help inform the NIJ Director of funding decisions. We're going to discuss common panel criticisms that my colleagues and I have accumulated from the years. There's often some common pitfalls or hurdles that many applications need to overcome. And then finally, we're going to wrap it up with some new expectations for this solicitation, and that will be followed by a Q&A Session.

So what is not covered in this webinar? The Expected Deliverables; what will not be funded; Recommended Resources for you to view and consume before you apply; and the Application Process. But for--if you desire information on those, you can go to the transcript of a previous webinar we've just completed, the Research and Evaluation on the Administration of Justice solicitation. That's another open and competitive solicitation. Right now I encourage you to check it out, the solicitation if you haven't. But at the--appended to the bottom of this solicitation, you'll see the transcripts of the webinar and for these topics above it would be the exact same for this solicitation. This was determined to do that to give you more time for Q&A and make sure that we answer all your questions. So to begin with, the Review and Selection Process for proposals. It is important to know the basic and technical requirements for the solicitation. There are Basic Minimum Requirements that are deemed critical for an application to be evaluated. Meaning that if the application does not have any of these components, it cannot be evaluated in peer review or internally with NIJ staff. So every application must include a budget detail worksheet. In the past, these were two separate documents: the budget narrative or budget justification, however you prefer, and the budget detail worksheet. Now, we've created a template for you that merges those two documents, make it easier, hopefully, for you and our reviewers, to review your budget materials. The Program Narrative. This is your--the meat, if you will, of the application. This is where you're describing your proposed research, and in the solicitation itself, there's a step-by-step guide of what that narrative should contain. The

resumes or CVs of key personnel. And key personnel, for this solicitation, is determined to be any and all principal or co-principal investigators. The CVs have to be included for those personnel. Again, if you do not have the above components in your application, it will not be deemed as meeting the Basic Minimum Requirements. Also, there are Technical Merit Requirements. These--you need to meet these to be deemed responsive to the scope of the solicitation. For this solicitation, you must use a Randomized Controlled Trial, RCT design, and it needs to be responsive or conducting research on at least one activity listed under an objective within the NIJ Policing Strategic Research Plan. My colleague, Dr. Joel Hunt, will discuss this in greater detail later in the webinar. But remember, we need to meet Basic Minimum Requirements, include these critical elements of the application, and in the application checklist, at the end of your--the solicitation document, these elements are highlighted as critical, and then also, you need to be responsive to the scope of work that is out--laid out in the program specific section in the solicitation.

For those applications that meet Basic Minimum Requirements and are deemed responsive to the solicitation, they meet the Technical Merit Review, these applications will be reviewed via External Peer Review. These include expert researcher and practitioner reviewers. We reach out and try to call accomplished researchers and police practitioners, and we really try to ensure that there is a diverse and accomplished set of reviewers for each application. And then once the External Peer Review is done, they're going to submit to NIJ their thoughts on the selection criteria, the strengths and weaknesses for each selection criteria. For those of you who have applied before, you will receive--whether you are funded or not, you will receive comments from the External Peer Review based on their thoughts on the--on your proposal as it relates to the selection criteria. This is very useful even if you are funded to look at your project, to look at your proposal, and see where enhancements can be made. Just to note, especially for those of you who have never applied to NIJ before, we do--we do not change substantively anything that the peer review included in those comments, but we do try to do some light editing, just to make it more easily understandable, to make it more clear, but you're basically seeing comments that are compiled from multiple reviewers, and they do talk about high-quality applications in a consensus review meeting, and the notes are--of that meeting as well, but there may be some redundancies and there may be some conflicting statements, but as I've said to past applicants, we deem any information as good information, and we want to give an accurate and clear picture of what all the peer reviewers who reviewed your application thought. High-quality applications will then go to an Internal Review from NIJ scientific staff, like those of us who are presenting today and others. And we will also solicit feedback from subject matter experts within the department, and that--the results of that review is submitted through our leadership in a series of briefings. NIJ gives sole authority for funding decisions to the Director. And there's a number of different criteria or--information criteria to make that decision both internally and externally. So we receive a number of very good proposals every year. And there are a number of different factors that go in to the NIJ Director's decision: overall budget; the amount of money NIJ expects to spend on this solicitation; administration priorities; congressional

priorities. So every application is competing against each other, if you will, on the solicitation, and to an extent, competing with others for full budgetary consideration, given what's allowable, but I just want to, you know, convey a clear picture of everything that's going on, when those decisions are made. So the Selection Criteria for this solicitation. This is extremely important and you should consult the Selection Criteria when you're compiling your application. And this is the scoring formula, if you will, that the external peer review will use when they consider your application. So the Statement of the Problem and the Research Question, that's worth 20 percent. And, you know, it's really important that you convey to any external reviewer of your application and to NIJ staff, you know, the importance of the problem, how those research questions are going to advance knowledge on that problem, why this needs to be considered. Project Design and Implementation, as you can see this is worth 50 percent of the overall application scoring process. You know, we're judging here the quality and technical merit of the research design. Are the methods appropriate for the design? Do--is the data available or will it be made available? Does that--the use of that data make sense for the method applied here? Is this feasible to accomplish? Will it answer those research questions? And, you know, to reiterate, we are looking for Randomized Controlled Trials on these--on questions received for this solicitation. But, you know, the factors I just mentioned still apply. You need to convince reviewers that, yes, this RCT is feasible and it will advance knowledge on this problem. Potential Impact, this is 20 percent. You know, think of here, what is the ability to change criminal justice problem based on this research. And as you can see, the Selection Criteria kind of flow together. You know, it would be difficult to see where a poorly constructed design could have a potential impact. But our reviewers and NIJ staff consider these criteria separately but they're definitely interrelated. And then finally, Capabilities and Competencies, this is 10 percent of the scoring criteria. We're looking for the demonstrated productivity and experience of that applicant organization and the proposed staff. We want to ensure that the applicant has the capacity to pull, you know, RCT and working with the police agency up. This is a very difficult task. And any experience you can show that you--that conveys trust of your ability to execute this on time and in budget is--would be a plus.   And then finally the Budget and Dissemination plans. These are not scored. We really want to ensure that the technical merit and the robustness of the research design carries most of the weight. But the Budget and Dissemination plans are still important. It is very important that your budget is logical and clearly represents the activities that you're proposing and that those activities proposed make sense based on your research design. And then also the Dissemination plans are critical because we're an applied science agency with the federal government. We want to make sure that our research we support is going to help influence policy practice and strategies for police practitioners. So, the dissemination plan is, you know, very important even though it is not given a numerical score. So now I'm going to turn it over to my colleague Dr. Chapman to continue the presentation.

DR. BRETT CHAPMAN: So some of the critiques that we've seen over the course of the years and these reviewed--these criticisms are really--they're fairly consistent that

we see in applications. One, we may have newer applicants that are not fully aware of what is required of them. Some things just get missed in the course of the submission. Some things tend to be unclear in the nature of--in the course of the proposals. But here are some of the things that we see overall is problematic that will make funding decisions difficult for your proposal if these things are found to be the case in your particular narrative and application. It's very important that you're clear as to what data is going to be collected and what's going to be analyzed. If those things are not clear in terms of your analysis plans, your proposal is likely going to be dead on arrival. Proposals, they need to demonstrate significance of the work. You need to be aware of the pitfalls and limitations. Details, details, details, details, very important. We are well aware that 30 pages sometimes prevents you from getting as much in the proposals that you want. You kind of have to weight those sections to see where you can get the true teeth of what you're going to do in that proposal in 30 pages. You have to demonstrate that your work's going to have some kind of--some kind of impact on criminal justice policy and practice. As my colleague said, we're an applied science agency, so we want to fund research that has some kind of practical value, in this case, the policing profession. Please look at your proposal to make sure they're organized well, they're not poorly written, or they lack coherence. And that is a problem with some of the poor performing proposals that we see time to time--time to time. Statement of the Problem, you need to be clear in how you--what gaps are going to be identified and filled in the course of your research and be careful that your literature review is up to par. I mean, we see this all the time, the lit reviews are--they're really small and they're--they lack detail, and of course as my colleague said, we're going to have people who are well aware of the literature and they're going to assess the feasibility of your literature review and how complete and concise it is. Research Design, very important. As my colleague said at the front end or just a minute ago, 50 percent of your score is going to go to the design and we see all the time where research design is not well articulated. If it isn't, you will not get considered. They will be probably--your proposal will likely fall during the course of the external review and probably would not make it to our internal review process because of a poor articulated research design. The questions should line up from the literature review. I mean, a lot of this, I'm probably not--I'm told--preaching to the choir, you probably noticed but again we see these problems crop up all the time. A sample size should be supported. Why a hundred or five hundred? Why 200 versus 2000? What's that number based on? So you should be able to articulate it and I will refer you back to the solicitation. We do have a section in the solicitation that refers to a power analysis and you should give that a quick review so you're clear of what our expectations are in terms of how you are articulating to us your choice of a sample size in your design. Protocol should be feasible. And also, you should talk about your comparison groups. We see biased comparison groups that's problematic, so you should be clear on your controls, your external groups and how you--how you're differentiating them--differentiate them, excuse me, and the reasons for them in your proposal.

Okay. Oftentimes, the design is too ambitions and too complex. And those things will be noted as well. Design should be clearly laid out, your sampling strategy should not

be flawed. And again I can't stress important more enough that your quantitative analysis or qualitative analysis should not be vague and it should be as clear as possible. Capabilities and Competencies, you know, the PIs should have a familiarity with the proposed work with the proposed--the analyses that are going to be conducted, whether it's quantitative or qualitative. Oftentimes, PIs have a limited experience in projects, that is not necessarily damning though, because we are--we do have a section where we recognize and welcome new researchers. So we, you know, the fact that you may not have that experience that's not a flaw--a fatal flaw but again, it can be fixed if you are as clear in your proposal as possible. Dissemination plans, and that really shouldn't be here but it's here so I'll talk about it anyway. Your plans should link to the proposed work. We get proposals oftentimes where it may be, for example, a policing solicitation and there's no mention of a police executive research forum, International Association of Chiefs of Police, and we're wondering, "Well, how are you going to get this out if you're not getting it out to the organizations or associations that can put it out to their memberships?" That's not saying if you have, you are required to put it out to a particular entity in terms of your dissemination. But dissemination plans should sync up with the work, the type of work, the field that you are trying to reach. So my colleague Dr. Hunt will talk about the expectations for this new solicitation.

JOEL HUNT: Thank you Dr. Chapman. So some of the things that are new this year in terms of this solicitation, and the first two are not unique to this solicitation but we want to highlight them since they're new in general. The first thing is the concept of Opportunity Zones. For those of you not familiar with Opportunity Zones, they were created in the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act Of 2017. It is a federal program that provides tax incentives for investments and new businesses and commercial projects in low-income communities. In order to further support Opportunity Zones, this solicitation gives priority consideration and award decisions to applications that propose projects that directly benefit qualified Opportunity Zones. To see where these qualified or qualified Opportunity Zones, some--you'll see them referred to as QOZs. There is a link in the solicitation to the webpage that I can't remember who hosts it, but the actual link is in our solicitation to see where these zones are. Next is High-risk List. Some of this is being handled slightly new this year. Almost all applicants this year are required to fill out the financial management and system internal controls questionnaire. As part of this questionnaire, the form requires each applicant to disclose whether it is currently designated as high-risk by a federal grant-making agency outside of DOJ. The purpose of this solicitation, high-risk includes any status under which 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 or awarding agency, the applicant must provide the following information. The federal awarding agency that's currently designating the applicant as high-risk, the date the applicant was designated high-risk, the high-risk point of contact at the federal awarding agency, their name, phone number, email address and the reason for the high-risk status as settled by the federal awarding agency. OJP seeks this information to help ensure appropriate federal oversight is provided on all OJP awards. Additional information about this is available in the

solicitation. So things that are much more of a substantive nature. Memorandums of understanding or strong letters of support with the appropriate entities. This wasn't referenced in Dr. Chapman's section though. We've had occasions where we've had awards that have been awarded and we've had--the sub-awardees come back to us and say that they weren't fully understanding of what they were agreeing to and some of the science involved in it and some of the expectations of what would happen within the research, and as such, some of those awards were forced to change locations. So in order to try to make this smoother, to try to increase the probability of success of these awards, we would--we are seeking much stronger either memorandums of understanding or letters of support typically in this case from police agencies such that the chief is writing a letter of support that clearly states an understanding of what the research proposed is and what their role and expectations and responsibilities will be before this research--proposed research project. The more detailed that is, the better understanding that that they show and understand what their expectations are, the better it will be. The archiving plan--the archiving requirements have now changed. There is now new requirements that state all data must be archived that is funded through NIJ awards. In the past, we've had people come back to us and say that they're unable to due to laws or purchasing agreements or things like that. We do allow for some wiggle room in that. However, it's not an expectation that you no longer archive anything. There's actually now requirements done in those cases that are appropriate synthetic control datasets are generated and then archived.

The last one, as we've alluded to throughout most of this, this--all applicants for this solicitation must propose an RCT design, a Randomized Control Trial design. The definition of this is out there. It's very clear what meets the criteria to be considered an RCT. We are going to be very picky about this, making sure people do truly adhere to a true RCT design. We are not here to tell you at what level you randomize or at what point or what unit of analysis. However, you must do an appropriate randomized sampling strategy. There must be discussion about the--a clear discussion on the controls and how you're going to minimize contamination and you're understanding that most likely there will be some level of contamination but how you're going to deal with that. What measurements and constructs are going to be created. Are these being created to create your randomization off of--how you're going to use them, clear statistical analysis plans. We don't necessarily expect you to say that you're going to use and generalize order logistic regression versus an ordered logistic regression, something like that but we--because you won't know until you have the data but what we want you to show that you have an understanding of the type of data you're going to collect and the most likely models that you're going to be able to run based on the data you collect. Incorporating these things into your application are much more likely to lead to a good application. Good.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: As you'll note on the screen right now, the application close date is May 7th, 2019, at 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time. It is a good idea to submit your application at least 72 hours prior to this in case there are any technical difficulties. So the next segment of our webinar will be questions and answers. As a reminder, the

transcript of the presentation and the slides will be posted to the NIJ website. Before we actually begin and dive into the questions, which we have only have three right now, so, if you have any questions, please go ahead and submit them. What you're looking at is a place that you can go to for application support or other general assistance. That's National Criminal Justice Reference Service. They are included--information about them is included in the solicitation. But it's also listed here. You can reach them at ncjrs.gov. They are able to help you with general solicitation support. If you have any questions that you think of after the end of this webinar, you would submit those to grants@ncjrs.gov. And they will work with Joel, Brett, and Eric to get an answer to you. You can reach them at webchat which is listed on the slide here, and again it is listed in the solicitation and there's also a toll free number. On the other side, if you're having problems, technical problems with submitting your application or uploading anything, you will need to reach out to grants.gov. Their information is also included in the solicitation and you can also find it here. There's a couple recommended resources from NIJ. So there's information about their funding opportunities and funding FAQ's located on the NIJ website. Information such as the budget details worksheet, and all that, you can find under the FAQ's. In addition, if you have questions about financial obligation and so forth for your solicitation you can go to the DOJ financial guide, their URL is listed here. There are also other funding resources available including the OJP Funding Resource Center, and the grants financial management online training. So again, these slides will be posted so you can go ahead and refer back to them for those URLs. And actually during the question and answer portion I'm going to just rotate through these slides so it'll give you an opportunity to go ahead and jot down the URLs. So at this time our first question is: "Is equipment and instrument least eligible under this grant?"

DR. BRETT CHAPMAN: And I would say yes, to the extent that it is linked to the proposed research and I should say these three questions came from the same person, so I can take them all in the same order. Yes, to the second again, rapid DNA testing to the extent that if--that research or the equipment it can be tied to your design in the proposed research, it would be eligible. Now, for the third question about whether your idea is supported by this grant, or this solicitation, I would refer you back to our policing strategic--our strategic research plan under policing. As you will see from those action items they are very broad and we did that with purpose. So that if someone had an idea that was more specific and it could fit under one of those action items, it will be deemed at least in the best way that you could make it, make your case up. It would be relevant to and applicable under that particular solicitation. So with respect to your third question about whether this particular approach is supported by this research proposal to this RFP, I would go back and look at the plan and look for an action item under which your proposal or research would fit. So I would start there.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: All right. So while we wait for other questions to be submitted, I'm going to go ahead and flip over to the NCJRS slide. You can go ahead and write some of that information down. Again, the other thing with NCJRS, there is a funding newsletter that comes out every Friday that has information about new funding

opportunities from OJP. And we'll also let you know when items such as the slides and transcript for this webinar are posted to the N--to the NIJ website.

Another question came through. "Since this solicitation has a strong special science component in relation to the policing and community relation, are submissions that incorporate more than one RCT model allowed?"

JOEL HUNT: I see no reason why not, though I would go back to what Dr. Chapman said and making sure you're not going too ambitious and too complex such that it's making the feasibility unlikely.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: All right. Again, and here are some of the resources available from NCJR--I'm sorry, from the National Institute of Justice. We can go ahead and have a few minutes to jot these URLs down while we wait to see if any other questions come through. If we do not get questions within the next minute or so, we will probably end this webinar at that--at that time. Again, if you do have questions after the webinar has ended, you can submit those questions to NCJRS at the URL listed both in the solicitation and here on the screen, grants@ncjrs.gov. You can also call them toll free at 800-851-3420 or you can use their web chat feature.

JOEL HUNT: Oh, I'm going to expand a little bit on the first two questions just for clarity that while equipment in leases are eligible to be funded, the bulk of the application funding cannot be for equipment purchases or leases, things like that. So if you're putting in a $325,000 application and 300,000 of it is for equipment, that would not be funded. So it--there has to be at least enough of a budget for the research component showing that this is a research award not a--an equipment buy award.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: Can MOUs and letters of support from organizations be submitted after the deadline or do they need--do they have to be sent together?

DR. BRETT CHAPMAN: They should be sent together and this is the reason why we do--we are mindful of the fact that sometimes these things take a while to secure from police agencies, but on the flipside of that, what we have seen is we get a proposal in that is provided with funding to do A and then we come back and a month later the department says, "No, we're not going to do that or we can't do that or it's not feasible." And then we look at what we funded relative to what the new applicants says they can do and oftentimes they're not the same thing. So to avoid that, we would like to have those MOUs and letters of support, and letters of support should go beyond "We support this project." To my colleague, Dr. Hunt's point, there should--there should be some clarity that the chief, the command staff, whoever is writing that letter, is clear of what they're granting permission to have done in their department. So I--we encourage those letters to come to be submitted in the application package. Excuse me.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: "Can you please repeat the answer to the last question on more than one model being allowed?"

JOEL HUNT: Yeah. So we see no reason to restrict your model or how many randomizations or how many models are within your application. However, you should be mindful of what Dr. Chapman mentioned in proposing applications that are too complex and I guess too complex would be the best word, too ambitious such that they lose the concept of feasibility in our eyes.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: Right. We will give you a minute or so to see if anything else comes through. At this time, there are no other questions. All right. It looks like we did get another one. "What is the schedule for disbursement?"

JOEL HUNT: So typically award applicants that are given awards are typically notified in August, September area. They'll be able to begin accepting the awards in October and typically with all of the requirements in terms of setting and getting budget approvals, and IRB approvals, and everything like that, awards do not typically start until January 1st then. There is another question right above that too.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: Is overtime pay police operations eligible under this grant?

DR. BRETT CHAPMAN: Overtime pay. Okay. So first what I would do is I--when I--we don't see these kinds of disbursements being allowed oftentimes. I would first refer the question back to the financial guide to see what's allowable. Again, it could be sometimes problematic if we see a budget where you have all of this grant money going to overtime, essentially paying the officers for their time. And that could be looked on not too favorably. So you--I would encourage you to start with the financial guide which is accessible on the website and it's right up in front of you if you see it. And then seeing what's allowable and look up things like incentives and overtime and see where that falls and what's allowable. And then you have to ask yourself, and we always have to look at, are you making the best use of the funds? Because again, if you're--we're talking about a $500,000 request and just throwing out a crazy number, 300,000 going to police overtime, that probably is not the best use of grant funds which come out of our tax dollars. So you need to--just to see how that works and what's allowable and then see how it--what is feasible and then also determine whether you're making the best use of the fund and then go from there.

JOEL HUNT: One of the things we consider is operationally realistic.

DR. BRETT CHAPMAN: Yes.

JOEL HUNT: If this can only--this type of research or this type of police work can only be done through overtime when it's received through several funds and it can't be on its own then that's something we take into consideration as to whether or not it's worth researching.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: And as Dr. Chapman indicated the URL for the grants--DOJ Grants Financial Guide is listed on the slide right now as well as some other resources that can help you when you are looking to prepare and submit your application. "Can we compare an entire police district as the control group and another district as the intervention or do we need to randomize within the same police district?"

JOEL HUNT: So it really is going to depend on what you're looking at. Is it possible to do randomization at that level? Yes. Unfortunately, I can't give a yes to your specific one because we can't comment on your specific ones. But that is a possibility for a research design for randomization component.

DR. BRETT CHAPMAN: Right now, I'm following that up with--you are--you are randomizing your design. So your design has randomization in it. So whether it's one level or another, to my colleague's point, we leave that in your hand. We see an R-- we're asking for RCTs, from what I'm saying you would be proposing an RCT, and that's about as much--as far as we can go in telling you how you should go about conducting that RCT.

JOEL HUNT: My one point that--thing I would hesitate slightly with the way the question is worded, it is those are both singular so how you're going to say that was truly random, one is just -two unless you pick two and you flip a coin as to which one is going to be control and intervention. All of that better be clearly laid out, and discussions about then how that randomization plays a role in your overall ability to do statistical analysis and come to findings.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: All right. Again, I'm going to put up the NCJRS slide for you, that way you can write that information down if you like and then I will also move over to the grants.gov slide as we wait for some other questions to come through. As a reminder, you could sign up for the funding newsletter through NCJRS that comes out every Friday. And you would be able to then stay in the loop on what's coming out from NIJ as well as the other agencies within the Office of Justice Programs. And then you will also receive notice when artifacts from webinars are posted, as well as when webinars are coming out. And then this is the information for grants.gov. They do have a customer support hotline number that's available 24 hours a day, seven days a week except for federal holidays. And you can also email them with technical support. As I mentioned earlier, it is recommended that you submit your application at least 72 hours in advance. That way if there are technical issues you have time to work through them before the deadline. There are very rare instances and when a technical issue--you will be granted permission past the deadline based on technical problems. So it's good to start early.

JOEL HUNT: Especially if you're a new awardee signing up for some of the things that are required it takes time.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: Yes. Look through the solicitation for the required information registering with grants.gov and so forth and do that as soon as possible. Do not wait until a week before the deadline. In fact that should have been started already. And if you haven't started that, do so today as soon as you finish with this call, in that way you have that all squared away and you'll be ready. All right. At this time, there are no other questions. I think we're going to end this webinar.

DR. BRETT CHAPMAN: Well, I would like to thank you for attending. On the behalf of the Nation Institute of Justice. Thank you for your interest in this funding opportunity. We wish you luck. Should you have any question, I believe any other questions of a substantive nature can come through NCJRS. We cannot answer them directly but if you ask them, they will be forward to us. We will forward an answer. As crazy as that exchange sounds, but that's the way we have to do it. So if you have any substantive questions about whether something meets the solicitation goals and objectives, you can forward your questions to us in that manner. And again, thank you for your time and good luck.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: Thank you all. You have a great day.

Webinar Overview

- What this webinar will not cover
- Review Process & Selection Criteria
- Common panel criticisms
- New Expectations
- Q&A Session

NIJ

What is not covered

- Expected Deliverables
- What is <u>not</u> funded
- Recommended Resources
- Application Process
- For more information on these topics please see the transcript and slides for the <u>FY19 Research and Evaluation on the Administration of Justice solicitation</u> webinar (appended to the bottom of the solicitation).

NIJ

REVIEW AND SELECTION PROCESS

NIJ

Basic and Technical Requirements

- **Basic Minimum Requirements (BMR)**
  - Submitted by an eligible type applicant
  - Must include:
    - Budget detail worksheet
      - Formerly two separate documents: budget narrative and budget detail worksheet
    - Program narrative
    - Resumes/curriculum vitae of key personnel
- Technical Merit Requirements (TMR)
  - Responsive to the scope of the solicitation
    - Must be responsive to at least one activity listed under an objective within NIJ's Policing Strategic Research Plan 2017-2022
    - Must use a randomized controlled trial (RCT) design (will discuss in later section)

NIJ

External and Internal Review

- **Those that meet BMR and TMR**

- **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

NIJ

Selection Criteria

- **Statement of the Problem and Research Questions** 20%
  - 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** – 10%
  - Demonstrated productivity, and experience of the applicant organization and proposed project staff
- **Budget**
- **Dissemination plans**

NIJ

COMMON PANEL CRITICISMS

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.
  - Failure 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 was 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.

NIJ

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 to too ambitious and too complex.
  - Proposed research design is not clearly laid out.
  - The proposed sampling strategy is flawed.
  - The proposed quantitative analyses is vague and unclear.

NIJ

Critiques Raised During Peer Review Process

- **Capabilities and Competencies**

  - The Principal Investigator (PI) does not demonstrate familiarity or proficiency with the proposed quantitative analysis.
  - Limited information 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.

NIJ

NEW EXPECTATIONS

NIJ

New Expectations Specific to this Solicitation

- **Opportunity Zones**
- **High-risk List**
- **Memorandums of understanding or strong letters of support with the appropriate entities**
  - **These letters should indicate a level of understanding of what the research entails and of the new archiving requirement (see below)**
- **Archiving plans that adhere to the new archiving requirements**
- **RCT design**
  - **Clear controls and discussions about minimizing contamination**
  - **Clear measurements/constructs**
  - **Clear statistical analysis plan**

NIJ

Solicitation Close Date:

May 7, 2019 11:59 PM EDT

NIJ

Application Assistance and Support

National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) Response Center

https://www.ncjrs.gov

- Provides solicitation support and general assistance.
- Links to all current OJP funding opportunities.
- Funding Notices - subscribe to receive email notifications of new opportunities:
  - Sign up to receive the bi-weekly JUSTINFO newsletter as well as the weekly Funding News From NCJRS email.
  - Be sure to select "Grants/funding" as an area of interest in your NCJRS registration profile when you subscribe.
- **email -** grants@ncjrs.gov
- **web chat** - https://webcontact.ncjrs.gov/ncjchat/chat.jsp
- **toll free** at 800–851–3420;
- **TTY** at 301–240–6310 (hearing impaired only)

The NCJRS Response Center hours of operation are 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. eastern time, Monday through Friday.

NIJ

Application Assistance

Grants.gov

- Provides technical assistance with submitting an application:
  - **Customer Support Hotline** – 800-518-4726 or 606-545-5035
    - The Grants.gov Support Hotline operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, except on federal holidays.
  - **Email**
    - support@grants.gov
    - **Website**
    - https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/support.html
- Provides information on available federal funding opportunities for various federal agencies.

NIJ

Recommended Resources from NIJ

NIJ Grants

– **https://www.nij.gov/funding/pages/welcome.aspx**

NIJ Funding FAQ's

– **https://www.nij.gov/funding/Pages/faqs.aspx**

NIJ CrimeSolutions.Gov

– **https://www.nij.gov/funding/Pages/faqs.aspx**

NIJ

Recommended Resources

OJP Funding Resource Center
– https://ojp.gov/funding/index.htm

2019 OJP Grant Application Resource Guide
– https://ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/Grant-App-Resource-Guide.htm

DOJ Grants Financial Guide
– https://ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/index.htm

DOJ Grants Financial Management Online Training
– https://ojpfgm.webfirst.com/

NIJ

thank You!