

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

March 15, 2019: On February 5, 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.

February 25, 2019: The link to the DOJ Grants Financial Management Online Training under “Financial Management and System of Internal Controls” was updated.

February 19, 2019: Information regarding submission of information pertaining to disclosure and justification for DOJ High Risk Grantees was redacted.

February 11, 2019: Information pertaining to project periods listed under Section B. Federal Award Information has been revised.

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 investigator-initiated, interdisciplinary research and evaluation projects related to the administration of justice in three areas: (1) eyewitness evidence; (2) police deflection strategies; and (3) forensic testimony. This program furthers the Department's mission by sponsoring research to provide objective, independent, evidence-based knowledge and tools to meet the challenges of crime and justice, particularly at the state and local levels.

Research and Evaluation on the Administration of Justice

Applications Due: April 19, 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. Federal agencies are eligible to apply. (Any award made to a federal agency will be made as an interagency reimbursable agreement.)

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

NIJ welcomes applications under which two or more entities would carry out the federal award; however, only one entity may be the applicant. Any others must be proposed as subrecipients (subgrantees).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.

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](#).

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.

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 April 19, 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-2019-15645

Release date: February 5, 2019

Contents

A. Program Description	4
Overview	4
Program-Specific Information	4
Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products	10
B. Federal Award Information.....	12
Type of Award	12
Financial Management and System of Internal Controls.....	13
Budget Information	14
Cost Sharing or Matching Requirement.....	14
Pre-agreement Costs (also known as Pre-award Costs)	14
Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver.....	14
Prior Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conference/Meeting/Training Costs	15
Costs Associated With Language Assistance (if applicable)	15
C. Eligibility Information.....	15
D. Application and Submission Information	16
What an Application Should Include	16
How to Apply	31
E. Application Review Information.....	35
Review Criteria	35
Review Process.....	37
F. Federal Award Administration Information	39
Federal Award Notices	39
Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements	39
General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements.....	40
G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)	41
H. Other Information.....	41
Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552 and 5 U.S.C. 552a)	41
Provide Feedback to OJP	42
Application Checklist	43

Research and Evaluation on the Administration of Justice

(CFDA No. 16.560)

A. Program Description

Overview

NIJ seeks applications for funding for investigator-initiated, interdisciplinary research and evaluation projects related to the administration of justice in three areas: (1) eyewitness evidence; (2) police deflection strategies; and (3) forensic science testimony. Applications that fall outside these three priority areas will not be considered. This solicitation aims to strengthen the knowledge base on these three priority areas, and to improve public safety by producing findings with practical implications. It supports the U.S. Department of Justice's priorities of reducing violent crime and enhancing investigations and prosecutions.

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 (please see [Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products](#) section 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 law prohibits 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

Applications that fall outside the three priority areas (categories 1, 2, and 3 specified below) will not be considered.

Category 1: Eyewitness Identification Evidence

Although NIJ's 1999 eyewitness identification guide for law enforcement based on expert opinion,³ and the National Academy of Sciences' 2014 report on the state of the science of eyewitness identification⁴ highlighted key areas involving eyewitness evidence, additional research is needed.

The correct identification of a suspect is known to be influenced by a number of factors. The positive identification of a suspect as the perpetrator, particularly by a crime victim, has been shown to have a significant effect on jury deliberations. Research on eyewitness memory has recognized several factors that can affect the accuracy and confidence of identification. Some factors, such as the stress or trauma at the time of the crime, or visual conditions that affect visibility of a perpetrator's features, are outside the direct control of the criminal justice system (typically called estimator variables). Other factors can be more directly controlled for by criminal justice system procedures (typically called system variables).

System variables occur throughout the investigation and eyewitness identification process. During the investigation process and initial identification of a suspect, practices regarding the structure and timing of witness interviews, the use of show-up identifications, the types of questions asked, or feedback and instructions given to the witnesses during questioning/profile generation can affect later suspect identifications. Additionally, the process of generating and administering lineups or photo arrays, including the selection, and number of non-suspect 'fillers' can also influence subsequent identification.

The ability of State and local police departments to increase the accuracy and reliability of eyewitness evidence may be hindered by the fact that implementation of established policies, practices, and training protocols may vary across police agencies.⁵

With this solicitation, NIJ seeks research proposals to examine the impact of current or newly created police practices, protocols, or procedures being implemented in police agencies on eyewitness evidence accuracy and reliability. NIJ welcomes both proposals that examine eyewitness evidence from the social and behavioral science and cognitive neuroscience perspectives. NIJ is primarily interested in applications proposing field studies involving a multidisciplinary approach. NIJ may entertain applications solely proposing laboratory studies, if the applicant makes a persuasive case that the study has the potential to produce findings with practical implications for significantly enhancing criminal justice processes.

Findings should contribute to the current body of knowledge on eyewitness evidence research and advance criminal investigation, prosecution, and court trial practices. Topics of interest include: techniques used to elicit information from witnesses; approaches designed to enhance eyewitness evidence accuracy and reliability; and assessments of how eyewitness evidence is evaluated by law enforcement, prosecutors, and other criminal justice stakeholders. Specific research questions include, but are not limited to:

³ Eyewitness Evidence: A Guide for Law Enforcement, <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/178240.pdf>.

⁴ Identifying the Culprit: Assessing Eyewitness Identification, https://www.nap.edu/catalog/18891/identifying-the-culprit-assessing-eyewitness-identification?version=b&utm_expid=4418042-5.krRTDpXJQISoXLpdo-1Ynw.1&utm_referrer=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.nasonline.org%2F.

⁵ National Survey of Eyewitness Identification procedures in Law Enforcement Agencies, <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/242617.pdf>.

- What is the impact of the construction and administration of lineups or photo arrays on suspect identifications?
- What is the impact of show-up procedures on suspect identifications?
- What is the relationship between eyewitness confidence and identification accuracy?⁶
- What is the impact of videotaping practices on eyewitness cooperation?
- What is the impact of existing or innovative law enforcement technologies on the identification of guilty suspects and elimination of innocent suspects?
- What case, defendant, and/or eyewitness characteristics mediate or moderate the effects of procedures on eyewitness evidence outcomes?
- How can the negative effects of stress and trauma, as it relates to the accuracy and reliability of eyewitness evidence, be mitigated?

Category 2: Police Deflection Strategies

Police deflection strategies (sometimes referred to as pre-arrest, pre-bookings diversion programs) represent alternatives to traditional responses to individuals who commit low-level criminal offenses. Many of these strategies are designed to reduce criminal behavior; decrease overall costs to the criminal justice system; provide solutions to enhance public safety; and strengthen relationships between the police and community residents. Deflection strategies combine intervention and prevention approaches to produce positive impact on communities. These strategies include various treatment components to promote positive changes in criminal offender behavior; improve confidence in the criminal justice system; and maintain public safety.

Deflection programs are designed to steer certain offenders away from different stages in the criminal justice system by addressing their substance abuse or mental health challenges with resources such as community-based or in-patient treatment interventions. In recent years, a number of such programs have been adopted, and although the potential of these strategies has been noted, additional rigorous assessments of these interventions are needed.⁷ NIJ is interested in evaluations of deflection strategies with research questions that may include but are not limited to:

- What is the impact of deflection strategies on re-offending (i.e., crime and/or drug use)?
- What is the impact of deflection strategies on cost to taxpayers and/or the criminal justice system?
- What case characteristics influence the potential success, if any, of the outcomes of deflection strategies?
- What is the impact of deflection strategies on police-community relationships?

⁶ Wixted, J.T., & Wells, G.L. (2017). The Relationship between Eyewitness Confidence and Identification Accuracy. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest* 18(1), 10-65.

⁷The Center for Health and Justice at TASC. (2013). *No Entry: A National Survey of Criminal Justice Diversion Programs and Initiatives*. Chicago: TASC.

Category 3: Forensic Science Testimony

Forensic science testimony and the forensic expert reports can have a powerful impact on juror perceptions of guilt or innocence of the accused. At the same time, forensic evidence relies on methods of a highly scientific and technical nature that jurors may have difficulty comprehending. Popular conception of forensic evidence is that it is highly probative for purposes of determining the culpability of a suspect, and juror misunderstanding of the limits of forensic evidence may occur.

NIJ-funded research has found that a forensic expert's years of experience may be more influential to potential jurors than testimony regarding the validity of the forensic method.⁸ This is potentially problematic, since forensic testimony can be highly technical and complex, and may rely on probabilistic statements that jurors may not comprehend accurately. Experts may express forensic results using a range of quantitative or qualitative conclusion scales to convey their meaning. Thus, it is critical that forensic testimony and reports be as clear and accurate as possible regarding the case implications of the evidence in question.

To address the possibility of inaccurate juror perception of forensic testimony and reporting, several entities are developing standardized terminology that can be used within and across disciplines to better convey the meaning of forensic data and results.⁹ In order to inform these efforts, NIJ seeks research around promising practices to enhance forensic expert testimony delivery in court proceedings, and to evaluate the impact of uniform forensic testimony and reporting guidelines.

With this solicitation, NIJ requests research proposals to examine the impact of current or newly developed practices, protocols, or procedures to enhance the clarity and accuracy of forensic expert testimony and reporting. NIJ encourages both proposals that examine forensic testimony from social and behavioral science and cognitive neuroscience perspectives, either studying actual court proceedings and case outcomes or simulated studies with mock jurors. NIJ may entertain applications solely proposing laboratory studies, if the applicant makes a persuasive case that that study has the potential to produce findings with practical implications for significantly enhancing criminal justice processes.

Topics of interest include, but are not limited to: strategies and practices to enhance the clarity, communication, and comprehension of forensic testimony; the actual effectiveness of these practices on juror perceptions; how these practices impact case outcomes; and implementation considerations, including how these practices impact requests for forensic analysis. NIJ is

⁸ Schweitzer, N. (2016). *Communicating Forensic Science*. Washington, DC: the Office of Justice Programs. <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/249804.pdf>.

⁹ The Organization of Scientific Area Committees (OSAC), administered by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), is developing a standard lexicon to help facilitate clear communications and to support development of standard terminology. <https://www.nist.gov/topics/organization-scientific-area-committees-forensic-science/osac-lexicon>. The OSAC and the latent print community have also recently proposed standards for an expanded conclusion scale to report comparisons, to include support for same or different sources, rather than solely source identification, source exclusion, and inconclusive. https://www.nist.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2018/07/17/standard_for_friction_ridge_examination_conclusions.pdf. In 2018 the U.S. Department of Justice began publishing Uniform Language for Testimony and Reports (ULTR). The goal of ULTRs is to create a series of guidance documents designed to standardize the expression of appropriate consensus language and provide guidance on the submission of scientific statements by the Department's forensic examiners when drafting reports or testifying. <https://www.justice.gov/olp/uniform-language-testimony-and-reports>.

particularly interested in research related to forensic testimony involving impression and pattern forensic evidence (e.g. firearms, latent prints). Specific research questions include, but are not limited to:

- Do practices to enhance the clarity and accuracy of forensic expert testimony and reporting impact:
 - Juror perceptions of forensic evidence?
 - Prosecutorial decisions and case outcomes?
 - Requests for forensic analysis of evidence?
- How should these practices be constructed to achieve juror comprehension of the relevance, strengths, limitations, and implications of forensic evidence for a particular case?
- What implementation considerations exist for adoption of practices guiding forensic expert testimony and reporting?

Additional Guidance Applicable to All Research Categories

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

Randomized Control Trial Studies

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

New Investigator/Early Career Opportunity

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

- Hold a non-tenured assistant professor appointment at an accredited institution of higher education in the United States or an equivalent full-time staff scientist position at a research institution; and
- Have completed a terminal degree or post-graduate clinical training within the ten (10) years prior to September 30, 2019; and
- Have never previously received NIJ funding as a PI on a research project with the exception of Graduate Research Fellows or Data Resources Program grantees.

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

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

Under this program, OJP will give priority consideration in award decisions to applications that propose projects that directly benefit federally designated Qualified Opportunity Zones (QOZ).¹⁰ 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>.

¹⁰ See Public Law 115-97, Title I, Subtitle C, Part IX, Subpart B, Sec. 13823.

Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products

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

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

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

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

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

Performance Measures

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

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

Evaluation Research

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

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

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

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

B. Federal Award Information

NIJ expects to make multiple awards with an estimated total amount awarded of up to \$2.5 million. Of the \$2.5 million proposed for this solicitation, NIJ expects that up to \$500,000 will be available for relevant research in Indian Country and Alaska Native villages. Awards will normally not exceed a three-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. No period of performance, including any requested and NIJ-approved extension, will exceed a maximum of five years.

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 that any award under this solicitation will be made in the form of a grant or cooperative agreement.

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

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

Financial Management and System of Internal Controls

Award recipients and subrecipients (including recipients or subrecipients that are pass-through entities¹¹) must, as described in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements¹² 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 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

¹¹ 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.

¹² 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.

Questionnaire (<https://ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/FinancialCapability.pdf>) that OJP requires **all** applicants (other than an individual applying in his/her personal capacity) to download, complete, and submit as part of the application.”

Budget Information

What will not be funded:

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

Cost Sharing or Matching Requirement

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

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

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

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

Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver

With respect to any award of more than \$250,000 made under this solicitation, a recipient may not use federal funds to pay total cash compensation (salary plus cash bonuses) to any employee of the recipient at a rate that exceeds 110 percent of the maximum annual salary payable to a member of the Federal Government’s Senior Executive Service (SES) at an agency with a Certified SES Performance Appraisal System for that year.¹³ 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

¹³ 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.

considered matching funds, where match requirements apply.) If only a portion of an employee's time is charged to an OJP award, the maximum allowable compensation is equal to the percentage of time worked times the maximum salary limitation.

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

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

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

OJP strongly encourages every applicant that proposes to use award funds for any conference-, meeting-, or training-related activity (or similar event) to review carefully—before submitting an application—the OJP policy and guidance on approval, planning, and reporting of such events, 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.¹⁴

Program Narrative Guidelines:

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

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

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

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

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

¹⁴ 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.

and demonstrate the validity and usefulness of the data they will collect. Applicants should consider the rigor and soundness of the methodology and analytical and technical approaches for the proposed research and address the feasibility of the proposed project and potential challenges or problems in carrying out the activities.

- Potential Impact. Applicants should describe the potential impact of the research and how it may inform or improve criminal or juvenile justice-related policy, practice, or theory in the United States.

The discussion of impact should include a discussion of the deliverables, including planned scholarly products indicated in the project-specific information on page 10, and a plan for dissemination to appropriate audiences. Applicants should identify plans to produce or make available to broader interested practitioners and policy makers in a form that is designed to be readily accessible and useful to them.

- Capabilities/Competencies. This section should describe the experience and capability of the applicant organization, key staff, and any proposed subgrantees (including consultants) that the applicant will use to implement and manage this effort and the federal funds under this award, highlighting any previous experience implementing projects of similar scope, design, and magnitude. Applicants should address:
 - Experience and capacity to work with the proposed data sources in the conduct of similar research efforts.
 - Experience and capacity to design and implement rigorous research and data analysis projects.
 - Experience producing and disseminating meaningful deliverables.

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

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

- Bibliography/references.
- Any tools/instruments, questionnaires, tables/charts/graphs, or maps pertaining to the proposed project that are supplemental to such items included in the main body of the narrative.
- Curriculum vitae or resume of the principal investigator and any and all co-principal investigators. In addition, curriculum vitae, resume, or biographical sketches of all other individuals (regardless of “investigator” status) who will be significantly involved in substantive aspects of the proposed project (including, for example, individuals such as statisticians used to conduct proposed data analysis).

- To assist OJP in assessing actual or apparent conflicts of interest (including such conflicts on the part of prospective reviewers of the application), a complete list of the individuals named or otherwise identified anywhere in the application (including in the budget or in any other attachment) who will or may work (or advise or consult) on the proposed research, development, or evaluation project. This applies to all such individuals, including, for example, individuals who are or would be employees of the applicant or employees of any proposed subrecipient entity, any individuals who themselves may be a subrecipient, and individuals who may (or will) work without compensation (such as advisory board members). This appendix to the program narrative is to include, for each listed individual: name, title, employer, any other potentially-pertinent organizational affiliation(s), and the individual's proposed roles and responsibilities in carrying out the proposed project. If the application identifies any specific entities or organizations (other than the applicant) that will or may work (or advise or consult) on the proposed project, without also naming any associated individuals, the name of each such organization also should be included on this list. Applicants should use the "Proposed Project Staff, Affiliation, and Roles" form available at <https://www.nij.gov/funding/documents/nij-project-staff-template.xlsx> to provide this list.

If the application (including the budget) identifies any proposed non-competitive agreements that are or may be considered procurement "contracts" (rather than subawards) for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements the applicant also must list the entities with which the applicant proposes to contract. Applicants should provide this list as a separate sheet entitled "Proposed non-competitive procurement contracts."

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

- Proposed project timeline and expected milestones.
- Human Subjects Protection paperwork (documentation and forms related to Institutional Review Board (IRB) review). (See [nij.gov/funding/humansubjects/Pages/welcome.aspx](https://www.nij.gov/funding/humansubjects/Pages/welcome.aspx)) **Note:** Final IRB approval is not required at the time an application is submitted.
- Privacy Certificate (for further guidance go to [nij.gov/funding/humansubjects/pages/confidentiality.aspx](https://www.nij.gov/funding/humansubjects/pages/confidentiality.aspx)).
- List of any previous and current NIJ awards to the applicant and investigator(s), including the NIJ-assigned award numbers and a brief description of any scholarly products that resulted in whole or in part from work funded under the NIJ award(s). (See "Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products" under "Program-Specific Information," above, for definition of "scholarly products.")
- List of other agencies, organizations, or funding sources to which this application has been submitted (if applicable).

- Applicants proposing to use incentives or stipends payments as part of their research project design, must submit an incentive or stipend approval request, as a separate document, according to the requirements set forth at <https://www.nij.gov/funding/Pages/research-participant-costs-and-incentives.aspx>.
- Data archiving plan. Applicants should anticipate that NIJ will require (through special award conditions, that relevant data sets resulting in whole or in part from projects funded under this solicitation be submitted for archiving with the NACJD. See www.nij.gov/funding/data-resources-program/applying/Pages/data-archiving-strategies.aspx.)

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

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

Note that required data sets are to be submitted 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 all costs, and how those costs are necessary to the completion of the proposed project. The narrative may include tables for clarification purposes, but need not be in a spreadsheet format. As with the Budget Detail Worksheet, the budget narrative should describe costs by year.

c. Cofunding

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- [Subawards under OJP Awards and Procurement Contracts under Awards: A Toolkit for OJP Recipients.](#)
- [Checklist to Determine Subrecipient or Contractor Classification.](#)
- [Sole Source Justification Fact Sheet and Sole Source Review Checklist.](#)

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

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

1. Information on proposed subawards

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

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

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

2. Information on proposed procurement contracts (with specific justification for proposed noncompetitive contracts over \$250,000¹⁵)

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

¹⁵ 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.

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:

- (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 applications¹⁶

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.

¹⁶ 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.

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.

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 Grantees¹⁷ (if applicable)

An applicant that is designated as a DOJ High Risk Grantee is to submit [REDACTED], 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 be 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

¹⁷ 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.

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 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 in specified 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 the 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/IndCPRRegister> to complete the registration form and create a username and password for Grants.gov. (An applicant applying as an individual should complete all steps except 1, 2, and 4.)

Registration and Submission Steps

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

This unique entity identifier is used for tracking purposes, and to validate address and point of contact information for applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. It will be used throughout the life cycle of an OJP award. Obtaining a DUNS number is a free, one-time activity. Call Dun and Bradstreet at 866-705-5711 to obtain a DUNS number or apply online at www.dnb.com. A DUNS number is usually received within 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; National Institute of Justice Research, Evaluation, and Development Project Grants and the funding opportunity number is NIJ-2019-15645.

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 April 19, 2019.

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

Note: Application Versions

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

Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues

An applicant that experiences unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond its control that prevent it from submitting its application by the deadline must contact the [Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline](#) 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 10 percent of the score in the assessment of the application's technical merit.

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

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

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

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

Potential Impact – 20%

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

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

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

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

Budget

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

1. Total cost of the project relative to the perceived benefit (cost effectiveness).
2. Appropriateness of the budget relative to the level of effort.
3. Use of existing resources to conserve costs.
4. Alignment of the proposed budget with proposed project activities.
5. Proposed plan (if any) to produce or to make available to broader interested audiences, such as criminal/juvenile justice practitioners or policymakers, summary information from the planned scholarly products of the project.

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

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

Review Process

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

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

- The application must be submitted by an eligible type of applicant.
- The application must request funding within programmatic funding constraints (if applicable).
- The application must be responsive to the scope of the solicitation.
- The application must include all items designated as “critical elements.”
- The application, if submitted by an applicant that is a DOJ High Risk Grantee,¹⁸ 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

¹⁸ See “Applicant Disclosure and Justification - DOJ High Risk Grantees” under “What an Application Should Include,” above, for a definition of “DOJ High Risk Grantee.”

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").

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 for will be made by the Director of the National Institute of Justice, who may take into account not only peer review ratings and NIJ recommendations, but also other

factors as indicated in this section. The NIJ Director may also take into consideration whether the principal investigator is new to his or her career and new to NIJ's research grant portfolios, and meets the criteria outlined on page 9 of this solicitation, and whether RCT methods are proposed in the application.

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 physical signature of the award document by the authorized representative and the scanning and submission of the fully-executed award document to OJP.

Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements

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

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

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

The webpages accessible through the "[Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements – FY 2018 Awards](#)" are intended to give applicants for OJP awards a general overview of important statutes, regulations, and award conditions that apply to many (or in some cases, all) OJP grants and cooperative agreements awarded in FY 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 grant or cooperative agreement. Any award made as a cooperative agreement will include a condition in the award document that sets out the nature of the “substantial federal involvement” in carrying out the award and program. Generally stated, under OJP cooperative agreement awards, responsibility for the day-to-day conduct of the funded project rests with the recipient. OJP, however, may have substantial involvement in matters such as substantive coordination of technical efforts and site selection, as well as review and approval of project work plans, research designs, data collection instruments, and major project-generated materials. In addition, OJP often indicates in the award terms and conditions that it may redirect the project if necessary.

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

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/FAPIS.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 the Administration of Justice

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

What an Applicant Should Do:

Prior to Registering in Grants.gov:

- _____ Acquire a DUNS Number (see page 33)
- _____ Acquire or renew registration with SAM (see page 33)

To Register with Grants.gov:

- _____ Acquire AOR and Grants.gov username/password (see page 33)
- _____ Acquire AOR confirmation from the E-Biz POC (see page 33)

To Find Funding Opportunity:

- _____ Search for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov (see page 33)
- _____ Access Funding Opportunity and Application Package (see page 34)
- _____ Sign up for Grants.gov [email](#) notifications (optional) (see page 31)
- _____ 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 15)

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 34)

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

- _____ Please refer to the section: Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues (see page 34)

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 16)
- _____ Project Abstract (if applicable) (see page 17)
- _____ Program Narrative (critical element) (see page 17)
- _____ Budget Detail Worksheet (critical element) (see page 22)
- _____ Budget Narrative (critical element) (see page 22)
- _____ Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable) (see page 25)
- _____ Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable) (see page 26)

- _____ Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire (see page 26)
- _____ [Disclosure of Lobbying Activities \(SF-LLL\)](#) (see page 27)
- _____ Additional Attachments
 - _____ Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications (see page 27)
 - _____ Applicant Disclosure and Justification – DOJ High Risk Grantees (if applicable) (see page 28)
 - _____ Curriculum vitae or resume (critical element) (see page 19)
 - _____ Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity (see page 29)
- _____ Request and Justification for Employee Compensation; Waiver (if applicable) (see page 14)
- _____ Documentation of Anticipated Benefit to federally designated Qualified Opportunity Zones (if applicable) (see page 30)

Funding Webinar Transcript

On February 5, 2019, NIJ hosted a webinar that provided an overview of our open solicitation “Research and Evaluation on the Administration of Justice.”

Following are the transcript and slide presentation from that webinar.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: Good afternoon, everyone, and welcome to today's webinar, Funding Opportunities through the National Institute of Justice for Administration of Justice, Fiscal Year 2019 sponsored by the National Institute of Justice. Today's presentation is about an open and competitive funding opportunity. As a result, today's presenters will not be able to offer you any guidance on the scope or design of your application. At this time, I would like to introduce you to today's presenters, Dr. Brett Chapman and Eric Martin, social science analysts for the Office of Research and Evaluation within the National Institute of Justice, and Dr. Jonathan McGrath, senior policy analyst, Office of Investigation and Forensic Sciences within the National Institute of Justice. Eric, you can go ahead.

ERIC D. MARTIN: Eric Martin, as Mary Jo just said. I'm going to start off our presentation on this funding opportunity. Just to give you a bit of an overview on what we're going to present on. First, we're going to talk about the goals of the specific solicitation, Research and Evaluation on the Administration of Justice. This solicitation has three topic areas of interest. We're going to give a brief overview on those and also direct to you to where in the solicitation you can find those. We're going to discuss the expected deliverables. And we're also going to share some recommended resources. Then I am going to pass it off and Dr. Brett Chapman will discuss some of the application process and review process. He will share some common criticisms we receive in a number of different solicitations from the peer review process, some excellent feedback if you think about preparing your application. Finally, we'll conclude with a Q&A session.

To begin with the goals of this solicitation, the Research and Evaluation on Administration of Justice, this solicitation supports the U.S. Department of Justice's priorities of reducing violent crime and enhancing investigations and prosecutions. Specifically, NIJ is looking for investigator-initiated, interdisciplinary research on three different topics: eyewitness evidence, police deflection strategies, and forensic science testimony.

For the first topic area, we're interested in evaluations of procedures that seek to enhance the accuracy and reliability of eyewitness testimony. For police deflection strategies, also known as Pre-Arrest Police Diversion programs, we're interested in evaluations that look at the effectiveness of those diversion programs on reducing reoffending. Finally, for the last topic area, we're interested in evaluations of new procedures and protocols looking to implement standardized testimonial language and

forensic reporting to enhance the clarity and accuracy of forensic expert testimony and reporting in the courtroom. In each of these three topic areas, NIJ lists a number of potential research questions one prospective applicant may consider. These are not meant to be exhaustive and —the applicant can submit any research question of interest as long as it falls within one of the three topic areas. NIJ will not consider applications that do not address one of these topic areas. Finally, at the end of the discussion of the three topic areas, NIJ provides a list of general guidance that are applicable to all topics. For more information on these topic areas, look at the program specific information, which is pages five through eight in the solicitation.

The expected deliverables for successful applicants who are awarded in the solicitation, there are standard grant reporting requirements. These include quarterly and final financial reports, and then semi-annual research performance progress reports. These semi-annual reports are due at the end of January and at the end of June for each funded project. Most projects awarded in a fiscal year start January 1 of the following year and so the first performance progress report is not expected or due for the grantee. You would then follow up and go in the summer progress reporting cycle. This solicitation also requires associated data sets and files, if appropriate. We expect our grantees to archive their data with our partner, the ICPSR at University of Michigan. More information is available on that in the solicitation.

In 2014, we switched our final reporting procedures where in the past we used to require a final technical report. Now we require at the end of the project, a 10-page executive summary. The goal of this is to give NIJ pertinent information of the project that we could share with our constituencies, but also to free up our grantees to work on peer review journal articles and also presentations at appropriate scientific and practitioner conferences.

What will not be funded? Again, as I said at the outset, applications that are not responsive to this specific solicitation. So again, just to reiterate, we are looking for applications that are studying procedures meant to enhance the accuracy and reliability of eyewitness testimony, evaluations of police deflection programs or pre-arrest diversion programs, and also evaluations of protocols to enhance forensic expert testimony in the courtroom. Then also we will not fund projects looking to specifically or exclusively, I should say, purchase equipment, material, and supplies. NIJ is a member agency of the Office of Justice Programs and we have a number of programmatic partners that do fund equipment or program implementation grants. NIJ will allow equipment purchases in their award budgets, but this is important, all equipment purchases need to be justified in terms of conducting the research. So as long as an applicant can make that justification that this equipment is necessary to successfully conduct the research project, those are allowable.

Here is a list of recommended resources for you. For applicants who have never applied to NIJ, I suggest looking at those early in the application process. This will assist you putting together your application and also have an understanding of what's expected

and required of you as an NIJ grantee. One is the Office of Justice Program's Funding Resource Center and the website is listed there. The DOJ Grants Financial Guide, the DOJ Grants Financial Management Training, and then we have information on NIJ grants. This will give you both current funding opportunities and also past opportunities. Within the past opportunities, you will see links of what was funded, which is also very good information.

I'm going to start you off on the application process and then I'll pass it to my colleague, Dr. Chapman. Here is an application checklist for what is expected to be submitted with the application. You can find this at the end of the solicitation, pages 44 and 45. I'm just going to quickly run through these. Your SF-424, that's the Application for Federal Assistance. This details the name of the proposed project, the proposed start and end date, the funding amount requested, the official name of the grantee application institution, the project abstract, the program narrative, which is your 30-page description of the project you seek to implement. There's a very detailed guidance of what is expected in the solicitation. As you notice next to that in parentheses, is it is designated a critical element. These are items that have to be included in the application for consideration and to advance in the funding consideration process. These will be discussed in the next section.

Budget detail worksheet and narrative, these are both critical elements. If applicable, the indirect cost rate that's been negotiated, Tribal Authorizing Resolution or Executive Order, Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire, your disclosure of any lobbying activities, additional attachments, the disclosure of any pending applications. This is a disclosure of any grant opportunities you may have applied in the last year at a different institution for the same project. We want to be made aware of those applications. The CV or resumes for all critical research personnel, that's your principal investigator and all co-principal investigators. Again, this is designated a critical element. The statement of Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity. This is your institution's statement of how they handle potential conflicts of interest when they arise. Then also your identification of any conflict of interest you have if you were to engage in the project. If this is applicable, the request and justification for employee compensation, the waiver. Then a complete list of individuals named or otherwise identified as being a part of the project. This helps us identify any potential conflicts of interest on our end as the applications come in.

So to apply, register with grants.gov well in advance of the deadline. For those of you who may have not applied to NIJ before, I suggest going on and navigating these sooner rather than later just to make sure you are all squared away and ready to go. You need to acquire a unique entity identifier. If you do not have one, that is currently a DUNS number. You need to register with SAM. Then submit an application packet at least 72 hours prior to deadline. This will ensure that if there are any technical issues or any problems with the submission process, you have plenty of time to troubleshoot that or work with others to ensure that your application receives full consideration. Also please label the files that you submit very clearly so that it is evident to an outside

observer who's not familiar with your application when you submit it, what the files contain, and so it is very clear that you meet all the basic minimum requirements for applying. Now I'm going to turn it over to my colleague, Dr. Chapman.

BRETT CHAPMAN: Thank you, Eric. I just want to walk you through a few things that come up in the course of the review process. But let me reiterate one thing my colleague just said about the 72 hours. You do have a deadline on a specific date, but it's never really pretty when someone waits until the 11th hour to submit a proposal. And for some technical difficulties, they can't do so. I just want to forewarn you that any mistake on our part, on our end, if you encounter problems and the proposal is found to lack any of the required documents, it will not move forward. So I just want to urge you to go into the system, you have plenty of time to navigate things to make sure that we're getting all the required documents that we're supposed to receive. The bare minimum requirements. We're going to do a BMR. We're looking at all the proposals of the application to see if they meet the bare minimum requirements. So please note that these are four essential key documents that every application has to have in order to move forward: the program narrative; the budget detail worksheet; the budget narrative; and CVs, resumes, or biographical sketches. Sometimes we get those in various forms or formats. So we'll leave that to you to determine the best way to present those to us, and to present the people on your proposal.

Now here's the selection criteria in how everything breaks down. We have statement of the problem, the research questions, 10 percent. Please be clear that you have a clear understanding of the problem, the research questions that you are presenting, and also the importance to the research. The project design and implementation, that is obviously, as you can see, a very big piece of your proposal, including the quality and technical merit. What impact does your work have? We need to have that articulated clearly in the proposal as well. Oftentimes, we get these proposals and we don't see any real impact of the work other than it's something that the researcher wants to do. That doesn't do us any good as an applied science agency. The capabilities and competencies, 20 percent. You should clearly articulate all the staff that are required to be articulated in your proposal, make sure that we can delineate who's doing what. That is something I'll get to in a minute. Sometimes the proposal's not very clear who's going to do what, and the proposals will ultimately fail or fall.

The budget and dissemination plans. Although they do not have a percentage, it's important that you have those in the applications as well, particularly dissemination plans. We see these kind of generic plans that we're going to submit for publication to some organizations. That's not very clear. That really doesn't help us understand whether you have a clear picture of where and how you're going to get this research out. Once the staff has looked at the BMR/responsiveness review process, then your proposal will or will not move forward. If it doesn't meet the bare minimum requirements, it will not move forward. Then we conduct an external peer review process where we have independent reviewers coming in. These are technical and practitioner reviewers, and I'm seeing some of the names of people on this call, you're all familiar with that

process. We get a good sense of what the proposals are proposing and how they will benefit the field.

Then we go internal, and the science staff and leadership will look at your proposals. We will evaluate them to make the best decisions for our director as possible. As we've gone over, and a number of us have done this over a number of years, and when you see why proposals fall—and I guess I could save myself a lot of speaking by just saying details. Details, details, details. We are mindful that you only have 30 pages and you are trying to squeeze a lot of information in a 30-page limit. It's possible, it can be done. People get funded all the time from NIJ by doing it. But here are where some of the proposals tend to fall for a lack of a variety of things.

Data. What data were you collecting? How will it be analyzed? We see that oftentimes where the analysis really does not match up with the proposed research. Is there any demonstrated significance of the proposed work? Not just because someone wants to do it, because being an applied science agency, we are looking for what practical usefulness the research will have for the field. That's very important. Too many details are missing and that's almost a 100 percent guarantee that your proposal will not move forward if we are missing too many details, too many vague terms, the proposals that are overly broad. "We hope to do, we think we will do, we hope to get," those are really not helpful in giving a good, solid review for our internal leadership. So you have to be mindful. Again, details, details, details. Also proposals, and we see this all the time. Proposals are disorganized, disjointed, poorly written, incoherent. We really can't tell what is being proposed and, again, that's almost a death knell right there. Statement of the problem, and I'll go quickly through these as was stated at the top. These slides will be available if you want to go back and review them.

Literature review, insufficient, we often see this where we just don't have much and our peer viewers will point to the fact that while there is a wealth of information outside that's available, that was not included in this proposal. That tends to tell us that the applicant may not have a clear view of what he or she wants to do and may not have a clear picture of the current literature and that's a problem.

Research design, very important, because this is where the bulk of the percentage points are going to come from. The overall research design is not well articulated. If we can't tell how you're going to analyze and conduct the research, there's really nothing to evaluate on our end. It makes it virtually impossible for us to give the proposal a good clear review beyond saying, "No, this just does not hit the mark. Probably not going to be viable for consideration. Research questions are not tied to the literature review and the proposed research."

Sample size. Someone says, "Well, we're going to look at a hundred officers in our sample." Why a hundred? Why not 200? Why not 300? Where is that 100 number coming from? So it's very clear to us that there needs to be an articulation on your part

that you are clear in terms of how many people are going to be in your sample and why that sample size has been articulated in the proposal.

Comparison groups, we're looking for a potential bias. We want you to give us a complete picture of your design and how you're going to do what you're proposing to do. Are you considering bias in your sample, are you considering that you may not have, for example, enough in your sample? Are you considering drop out, mortality? It's very important that you give us as much information as you can cram in that 30-page limit.

Capabilities and competencies. I've been doing this for almost 20 years now and so these are a number of things that come up. There are others, but the PI does not demonstrate a familiarity with quantitative analysis for example. That might sound crazy but no, we get that a lot. It's very clear to us that things are thrown together. They don't really align well together. We kind of can come away easily with the conclusion that these folks don't know what they're talking about. And that's unfortunate. You can solve that by being as clear as you can in your proposal.

In the dissemination plan, and this is another thing that comes up where we see outlets that are really not aligned to the criminal justice system. For example, we get proposals and we're going to submit to psychological journals. No offense to anyone in that discipline. But again, if there's no real coherent reason as to why these journals and not others that are closely linked to what we do at NIJ, that can be a little problematic. You want to be clear in who are you going to turn to, how are you going to get this information out, how are you going to disseminate it. Again, be as clear as possible. I think we're at our question and answer.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: We can start Questions and Answer. I am going to flip to another slide. We're going to talk about a couple things before we start questions. First of all, we don't have any questions currently in the queue. So, it will give you some time to submit your questions. We are going to go ahead and show you some resource information. There's contact information here for the National Criminal Justice Reference Service. This information, you can use it, you can call them, use their toll-free number. You can email them at Grant@ncjrs.gov. And they also have a web chat available. Their information is also listed in the solicitation. So if you have any questions about the solicitation itself, you can submit the question and NCJRS will work with Brett, Jonathan, and Eric to get an answer to you. If you're having any technical issues with GMS, you need to contact GMS or grants.gov directly for those issues. Lastly, as we go into questions, again, this is an open and competitive solicitation, so the presenters will not be able to answer questions related to the scope or design of your application and proposal. At this time then, I would like to go ahead and start questions.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: There was a question earlier about the solicitation number and I shared that information. It is also on the first slide and we'll share that again in a little bit for everybody else. Again the slide deck will be shared with the participants on the NIJ website. NIJ will attach this slide along with the transcript to the solicitation.

There was a reference in the presentation to SAM. I'm not familiar with that reference, can you offer context to what this is? So sam.gov.

ERIC D. MARTIN: That stands for the System for Award Management. It's referenced on page 17 of the solicitation and it relates to the DUNS number and that's the unique identifier for the entity.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: The next question, If I submitted a proposal previously as an early career investigator but I was not funded, can I resubmit as an early career investigator?

BRETT CHAPMAN: You can resubmit your proposal, assuming that it is responsive to this solicitation. There is language in the solicitation about new investigators, so again, assuming that it meets the parameters of our solicitation. Now that does not guarantee that you will be funded this time around but, your chances are increased by adding information to suggest that here is where I fell short, here are the things I corrected, and then we take it from there.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: What about prescriptions about international organizations like NGO and very similar organizations?

BRETT CHAPMAN: I think if that's talking about eligibility, I would ask you to review the solicitation because I'm not really sure what's being asked there.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: This being an open RFP, is there a deadline? I apologize if I missed this. I joined late. So yes, there is a deadline right there on a slide. It is April the 19 at 11:59 p.m. Again, it is suggested that you do not wait until April the 19 and you submit your application at least 72 hours in advance.

Is there a sense of how much funding will be allocated for each of the three categories?

BRETT CHAPMAN: There's not a separate bucket of money across the three categories. We have 2.5 I believe to spend for proposals coming in through this solicitation. That money is not necessarily going to be separated by category.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: What does this early career investigator designation mean in terms of review?

BRETT CHAPMAN: I don't think it puts you at an advantage or disadvantage either way. The viability and feasibility of your proposal is going to be about the science contained in the proposal. Whether you're a new investigator or early career, I don't think that gives you any leg up. It doesn't put you behind either, if that's what you're asking.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: Last year's RFP also emphasized the use of RCTs. What percentage of applications actually funded incorporate an RCT design? How much emphasis should this be given?

BRETT CHAPMAN: Well, if you know our director, you know he's a big fan of RCTs. Now for this solicitation, I do not believe RCTs are required. But there is language in there to suggest that we are hopeful to receive RCT designs. So I would go back and read the solicitation, there is language in there about RCTs, but they are not required.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: Thinking about some successful projects in the past, can you say anything about the number and type of collaborators? Has there been any international collaboration?

BRETT CHAPMAN: Not that I'm aware of.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: So somebody's asking if there's going to be similar webinars for other solicitations, and there are a couple of other NIJ solicitations that will have a similar webinar, but not all of them are assigned webinars. It just depends. I'm sorry. I can't be more specific and perhaps if you tell me what you're looking for, I can answer it.

BRETT CHAPMAN: Yeah. The webinars are going to depend on the manager, but really the webinars themselves are going to really blend in and they'll be similar across different solicitations. But what you want to focus on, if I could say this, is to focus on the substance contained in that solicitation that you're applying to. Because what we've given you are kind of basics that can be applied across solicitations. But what you want to do is if you're —considering proposing something to a specific solicitation, focus on that solicitation and the substance contained therein. That will give you a good idea of what that solicitation is asking applicants to do, from a substantive standpoint.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: Am I understanding correctly that I would need to pair with another organization for research and we then would include an evaluation research plan or can we conduct the evaluation independently? They started off saying an evaluation office, so I don't know if you're saying that they are from an evaluation office and they want to know if they need to pair with another organization to do their research, and then they would include the evaluation. Not a 100 percent sure what the question is.

BRETT CHAPMAN: For example, if you are a research entity and you're partnering with a police agency, we would want you to have those agreements in place so that we're clear that you have that partnership in place at the time that your proposal is submitted. Now, there is language in the solicitation about partnerships and we encourage partnerships. Whether those are absolutely required would refer you back to the solicitation.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: Are mixed methods acceptable? Will qualitative elements be discounted?

BRETT CHAPMAN: Mixed methods are acceptable. Whether something is going to be—I'll make sure I use your word—discounted, that would depend on the nature of the research being proposed.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: Can you explain how NIJ evaluates a proposal that includes matching or other additional funds to support the work?

BRETT CHAPMAN: For the purposes of this solicitation, matching funds are not required.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: We are a group that specializes in forensics-related cannabis. Is there any way to find out about the background in this topic on the part of reviewers? We have experienced deficits in the ability of groups to handle this topic in the past.

BRETT CHAPMAN: The reviewers are anonymous. We, as the internal staff go to great lengths to make sure that the capabilities of the reviewers match the parameters of the solicitation areas. I apologize for what you've encountered in the past. But the only thing I could say to that is, one, no, you can't find out about the backgrounds because they're anonymous, but care is taken to make sure that the capabilities of our reviewers match the substantive areas that we're asking them to review.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: At this time, all the questions that are in the queue have been answered. We will give you a few moments to see if there's anything else that comes up. While we're doing that, I'm going to put the slide back up with contact information for the National Criminal Justice Reference Service. We'll give you a few moments to jot that down. I'm also going to share with each of you through the chat box the solicitation number that was asked by another attendee and so everybody will have that.

Part of being in an early career investigator is not having a lot of experience. How might this hinder my ability to compete, or is that the purpose of the designation to level the playing field and offer a chance to someone new?

BRETT CHAPMAN: I think it is a designation that allows for a level playing field. But if you ask me, the field is level, as is. I think I've said to someone who asked about this before. It doesn't give you an advantage to the other proposals because we're focusing more so on the science, and what's being proposed and how likely it is that it can be pulled off. But that said, we do want to encourage people who don't have a lot of experience to submit to our solicitations because that's the only way you get experience is to really get funding and to get in the game. I would say it doesn't hurt or hinder you. It

doesn't give you an advantage, but again the focus is on the science being proposed. That's the key ingredient of our funding decisions, the science.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: A follow-up to that is they're asking if it's necessary to collaborate with somebody that has more expertise, but I think you kind of addressed that, though.

BRETT CHAPMAN: Well, is it necessary? It's probably to your benefit. I'll give you an example. If I get a proposal looking at an area in policing and no one on the staff has any expertise in policing or doesn't understand policing, that can make it problematic because that research team may not be mindful of the nuances in certain policing areas. So it is to your benefit to have someone of that expertise in your area if that's what you're looking at, whether it's forensics, whether it's eyewitness, whether it's policing, whether it's anything. You want to have people in that staff who can speak to the area that you're looking to research.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: Are matching funds allowable even though not required? If so, how would it affect the evaluation of my proposal?

BRETT CHAPMAN: Matching funds, they are allowable. It's more that you're going to have to list from an audit standpoint. That's the only thing where matching funds really come into play. That's something that you're going to be responsible for to make sure that you're keeping an eye on all of the dollars and where everything is going, because it's subject to audit on our end. So they are allowable.

JONATHAN MCGRATH: Just to mention a little bit more information about co-funding and cost sharing and match requirements. There is a section in the solicitation that goes into additional detail and has some additional links to more information. It's subtitle C in co-funding on page 22.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: If a document transmitted during the application for this grant is unclear, do you automatically archive and reject the application or ask the principal investigator for information?

BRETT CHAPMAN: If there is something that's unclear at the time that you submit the proposal, will we get back to you? No. If there is something unclear after the decision has been made to fund your proposal, we might come back to you for clarification questions. But if it's something where we're looking in the course of the review before it's either reviewed by the peer reviewers or sometime during that process? No. If it's unclear, and it's not clear to the peer reviewers, it's probably not going to move forward.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: Can you give some insight into the makeup of the reviewers? Are they mostly scientists or practitioners?

BRETT CHAPMAN: Both. It depends on the solicitation. A lot of our solicitations, we would have an even split. When we were running our, what were called standing peer review panels, the composition of the panels weighted heavily towards the scientists as opposed to practitioners. But again, typically it might be an even split or it could be weighted a little more so to the scientists, but we have both groups on our panels.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: If we can justify the purchase of a vehicle to complete the research project, are vehicles eligible as an equipment item?

BRETT CHAPMAN: Well, as my colleague said, if you can justify equipment, sure. Now, that said, I have yet to see a proposal where we have funded someone to conduct research with equipment that included vehicles. And I've seen Harley-Davidsons, motorhomes, all kinds of stuff come in. Now what I would also advise you to do is look into financial guide because that could be something that's not allowable. If it's a piece of equipment or it's a line item that's not allowable, it will be in the financial guide. Now if it's not there, give it your best shot.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: Last year's awards on pre-diversion programs were predominantly focused on court-based programs. Is there a preference for funding proposals on court-based programs as opposed to police-based programs?

BRETT CHAPMAN: So that question tells me—and it's a good question—that you are familiar with last year's solicitation. This one was a little different, although we focused on the administration of justice. You know that from last year, we sized down the substantive areas, so I would urge you to go back and look at that section on deflection, because I think you will find the answer to that question in the solicitation.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: We do not have any other questions at the time. I'll give you a couple minutes to see if you have anything else. I did move to the beginning slide deck where it has the solicitation number at the top here, right underneath the title. Somebody had asked for it and I did add it to the chat box. But if it you need it, it's here and you can take a chance to jot that down if you like. Again as a reminder, if you have any questions about the solicitation after the webinar has ended, please submit those questions to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service. You can find their contact information on the second page, I think it is, of the solicitation. It's also listed here. You can email them at Grants@njrs.gov, that's Grants@ncjrs.gov. We also have a toll-free number, 800-851-3420. So you can contact them that way if you like.

There does not seem to be any other questions so at this time, we are going to end the webinar. On behalf of the National Institute of Justice, I would like to thank you for joining today's webinar and we look forward to receiving your applications. Have a great day.

Funding Opportunities through NIJ for the Research and Evaluation on the Administration of Justice, Fiscal Year 2019

Solicitation: NIJ-2019-15645

Solicitation Post Date: February 5, 2019

Solicitation Close Date: April 19, 2019 11:59 PM EDT

Today's Presenters:

Brett Chapman, Social Science Analyst, Eric D. Martin, Social Science Analyst, Office of Research and Evaluation, and Jonathan McGrath, Senior Policy Analyst, Office of Investigative and Forensic Sciences



NIJ

NIJ | *National Institute
of Justice*

STRENGTHEN SCIENCE. ADVANCE JUSTICE.

Webinar Overview

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



Goals of Research and Evaluation on the Administration of Justice solicitation

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

This solicitation seeks investigator-initiated, interdisciplinary research and evaluation projects related to the administration of justice in three areas: (1) eyewitness evidence; (2) police deflection strategies; and (3) forensic science testimony.



NIJ

Expected Deliverables

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



What will not be funded

- Applications...

- that are not responsive to this specific solicitation

- whose primary purpose is to purchase equipment, materials, or supplies*

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



NIJ

Recommended Resources

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



APPLICATION PROCESS



NIJ

Application Checklist | Requirements

– See pages **44-45** of the solicitation

- What an Application Should Include:

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



NIJ

Application Checklist | Requirements

– See pages **44-45** of the solicitation

- Additional Attachments

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



Application Submission

- Grants.gov

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

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



REVIEW PROCESS



NIJ

Basic Minimum Requirements

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



Selection Criteria

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

External and Internal Review

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

Critiques Raised During Peer Review Process

- **Overall Problems in Applications**

- The proposal vaguely describes how the data will be collected and analyzed.
- Proposal fails to demonstrate the significance of the proposed work.
- 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.



Critiques Raised During Peer Review Process

- **Research Design**

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



Critiques Raised During Peer Review Process

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



Critiques Raised During Peer Review Process

- **Capabilities and Competencies**

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





QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

DISCUSSION



NIJ

Contact Information

National Criminal Justice Reference Service Response Center (NCJRS)

Toll-free +1 (800) 851-3420

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

Email Grants@ncjrs.gov

Fax +1 (301) 240-5830

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

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



NIJ

Solicitation Close Date:

April 19, 2019 11:59 PM EDT



NIJ

Thank You!



NIJ