Notices regarding the solicitation “FY 2017 Comprehensive School Safety Initiative”

February 15, 2017: Answers to questions have been posted. To assist applicants in completing their proposals, NIJ has made the answers to questions received available for this funding opportunity. Visit https://nij.gov/funding/pages/solicitation-qa.aspx#NIJ-2017-11147 for questions and answers to help prepare your application.

The original solicitation document begins on the next page.

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
National Institute of Justice

OMB No. 1121-0329
Approval Expires 12/31/2018

The U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), Office of Justice Programs (OJP), National Institute of Justice (NIJ) is seeking applications for funding under the Comprehensive School Safety Initiative (CSSI). This program furthers the Department's mission by funding rigorous research to produce practical knowledge that can improve the safety of schools and students. The initiative is carried out through partnerships among researchers, educators, and other stakeholders — including law enforcement and mental health professionals. Projects funded under the CSSI are designed to produce knowledge that can be applied to schools and school districts across the nation for years to come. This solicitation includes five funding categories with different expectations and requirements to accomplish the purposes of the CSSI.

FY 2017 Comprehensive School Safety Initiative

Applications Due: March 24, 2017

Eligibility

In general, NIJ is authorized to make grants to, or enter into contracts or cooperative agreements with, States (including territories), units of local government, federally recognized Indian tribal governments that perform law enforcement functions (as determined by the Secretary of the Interior), nonprofit and for-profit organizations (including tribal nonprofit and for-profit organizations), institutions of higher education (including tribal institutions of higher education), and certain qualified individuals. Local education agencies (LEAs), public charter schools that are recognized as an LEA, and State education agencies (SEAs) are eligible to apply.

For-profit organizations must agree to forgo any profit or management fee. Foreign governments, foreign organizations, and foreign colleges and universities are not eligible to apply.

NIJ welcomes applications under which two or more entities would carry out the federal award; however, only one entity may be the applicant. Any others must be proposed as subrecipients ("subgrantees")[1]. The applicant must be the entity that would have primary responsibility for carrying out the award, including administering funding and managing the entire project, including monitoring and appropriately managing any subawards ("subgrants"). While NIJ is open to applications submitted by entities other than the research entity, in cases where LEAs and SEAs partner with a researcher, NIJ strongly recommends that the research entity serve as the applicant (the "prime") for CSSI awards, making subawards ("subgrants") to project partners as needed for the project.

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

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

NIJ may elect to fund applications submitted under this FY 2017 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 prior to submitting an application. All applications are due by 11: 59 p.m. eastern time on March 24, 2017.

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, 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 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 or 606-545-5035, 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 must email the NIJ contact identified below **within 24 hours after the application deadline** in order to request approval to submit its application after the deadline. 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 operates from 10:00 a.m. until 6:00 p.m. eastern time, Monday through Friday, and from 10:00 a.m. until 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-2017-11147

Release date: January 13, 2017

Contents

A. Program Description 4
Overview 4
Program-Specific Information 4
Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products 15
B. Federal Award Information 17
Type of Award 18
Financial Management and System of Internal Controls 19
Budget Information 19
Cost Sharing or Match Requirement 20
Pre-Agreement Costs (also known as Pre-award Costs) 20
Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver 21
Prior Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conference/Meeting/Training Costs 21
Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable) 21
C. Eligibility Information 22
D. Application and Submission Information 22
What an Application Should Include 22
How to Apply 34
E. Application Review Information 38
Review Criteria 38
Review Process 40
F. Federal Award Administration Information 41
Federal Award Notices 41
Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements 42
General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements 43
G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s) 43
H. Other Information 43
Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552 and 5 U.S.C. 552a) 43
Provide Feedback to OJP 44
Application Checklist 45

FY 2017 Comprehensive School Safety Initiative

(CFDA No. 16.560)

A. Program Description

Overview

The Comprehensive School Safety Initiative (CSSI) funds rigorous research to produce practical knowledge that can improve the safety of students and schools. The Initiative is carried out through partnerships between researchers, educators, and other stakeholders; including law enforcement, behavioral and mental health professionals, courts, and other justice system professionals. Projects funded under the CSSI are designed to improve understanding that can be applied to schools and school districts across the nation for years to come. This solicitation includes five funding categories with different expectations and requirements to accomplish the purposes of the CSSI.

Authorizing Legislation: Any awards under this solicitation would be made under statutory authority provided by a full-year appropriations act for FY 2017. 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 2017.

Program-Specific Information

NIJ has administered the CSSI since 2014. The initiative was a response to disturbing high-profile incidents of violence in our nation's schools. Schools are mostly safe places — but when violence occurs in a school, it strikes a blow against a fundamental institution within our communities. Educators and public safety officials grapple with the challenge of creating and maintaining a safe and healthy learning environment for students. CSSI is an investment in building sound and objective knowledge to improve the safety of schools, students, and communities across the nation.

CSSI is focused on K-12 public schools (including public charter schools). The initiative is concerned with all forms of violence that occur on school property during or outside of school hours, on the way to-and-from school or school-sponsored events, on school-sponsored modes of transport, or during school-sponsored events.

Framing the Problems that CSSI Aims to Address

CSSI funding may support and address a wide range of school safety activities. Within the program parameters and in furtherance of the goals and objectives detailed in this solicitation, applicants have considerable discretion in determining the kinds of school safety initiatives they propose to address. Applicants are strongly advised to review the previously funded projects.[2] While studies looking at similar topics will be considered, NIJ may give priority in award

[2] Interested applicants are encouraged to review descriptions of the 24 awards made by NIJ under CSSI in 2014 available at http://nij.gov/topics/crime/school-crime/documents/comprehensive-school-safety-initiative-awards-fy-2014.pdf#page=8, descriptions of the 25 awards made by NIJ under CSSI in 2015 at https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/249228.pdf, and descriptions of the 25 awards made under CSSI in 2016 at https://nij.gov/Documents/NIJ-CSSI-FY-2016-Awards.pdf.

decisions to well-designed research that expands the range of issues and strategies beyond this current pool of funded projects.

There are multiple authoritative sources that provide recommendations and guidance for those seeking to improve school safety. For example, the National Academy of Sciences published *Preventing Bullying Through Science, Policy, and Practice*,[3] the U.S. Department of Justice's Office of Community-Oriented Policing Services (COPS) partnered with the U.S. Department of Education to develop Safe School-based Enforcement through Collaboration, Understanding, and Respect (SECURe) Rubrics,[4] six relevant professional associations released *A Framework for Safe and Successful Schools*;[5] the U.S. Department of Education released *Guiding Principles: A Resource Guide for Improving School Climate and Discipline*;[6] and in 2013, a collection of federal agencies comprised of the U.S. Departments of Education, Justice, Health and Human Services, and Homeland Security released a *Guide for Developing High-Quality School Emergency Operations Plans*.[7] NIJ, through its National Law Enforcement Corrections Technology Center system, has produced a four-volume set titled *Sharing Ideas & Resources to Keep Our Nation's Schools Safe*, which features innovative ideas and practices from the field. Applicants are encouraged to consider these resources and others when developing their projects. Applicants should also seek out and consider any available research and evaluation findings relevant to proposed projects.

Every award made under CSSI must include a carefully developed research strategy with clear potential for producing findings that have practical benefits for schools, students, and communities at large. Research strategies should include clearly stated research questions, the most rigorous appropriate research design to answer those questions, a minimally intrusive data collection strategy, provisions for protecting students from unintended harm during the research process, and a plan for sharing findings with practitioners and policymakers who can most benefit from them. NIJ is open to supporting a wide range of appropriate and rigorous research designs to address and understand the full range of school and student safety issues and activities.

With few exceptions, most studies on school safety require educators and other stakeholders within the schools and in the community to work closely with researchers to ask the right questions, prioritize challenges, identify solutions, collect data, and make sense of the findings. No single profession or discipline holds all of the answers to the complex challenges of creating and maintaining safe learning environments for children — therefore applicants should consider multidisciplinary approaches. NIJ expects applications for CSSI to prominently feature close collaboration and partnerships involving schools, researchers, and others as necessary (e.g.,

[3] National Academy of Sciences Preventing Bullying Through Science and Policy can be downloaded here: http://www.nationalacademies.org/hmd/Reports/2016/Preventing-Bullying-Through-Science-Policy-and-Practice.aspx.
[4] COPS and Department of Education SECURe Rubrics can be found here: http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/supportingsafeschools.
[5] *A Framework for Safe and Successful Schools* was produced by National Association of Elementary School Principals, National Association of Secondary School Principals, American School Counselor Association, National Association of School Psychologists, School Social Work Association of America, and the National Association of School Resource Officers and is available at https://www.naesp.org/sites/default/files/Framework%20for%20Safe%20and%20Successful%20School%20Environments_FINAL_0.pdf.
[6] *Guiding Principles: A Resource Guide for Improving School Climate and Discipline* is available at http://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/school-discipline/guiding-principles.pdf.
[7] *Guide for Developing High-Quality School Emergency Operations Plans* is available at http://www.phe.gov/Preparedness/planning/Documents/eops-k-8.pdf.

justice professionals, parents, and students) to implement and study the proposed issues and activities related to school and student safety.

As noted on the title page, NIJ strongly recommends that research organizations be designated as the applicant (the "prime") for CSSI awards, making subawards ("subgrants") to participating stakeholders as appropriate for the proposed project. This arrangement is preferred in order to produce the highest quality research while reducing administrative burdens to SEAs, LEAs, and other stakeholders. Research organizations may be institutions of higher education, nonprofit or for-profit organizations, or public entities that have experience in conducting applied research and evaluation.

An applicant may propose to work with any combination of elementary, middle, or high schools, or may elect to focus solely on a single type of school or range of grades. An applicant should consider carefully the schools and grades that it will focus on based on the research questions it proposes to address. Care should be taken to assure that proposed programmatic and research activities are developmentally appropriate for the impacted student population. Applicants are also encouraged to consider appropriate ways to involve students and parents in safety planning and activities.

Applicants should consider interventions that include coordination with diverse partners including local law enforcement, behavioral and mental health professions, courts, criminal and juvenile justice professionals, as well as parents and youth. Proposed interventions should also take into account recent research findings related to disciplinary policies and practices that may be overly harsh or exclusionary. Such policies and practices have created what some refer to as a "school-to-prison pipeline" in which relatively minor student misconduct is subjected to suspensions, expulsions, and involvement with the criminal or juvenile justice system.

Areas of Interest for School Safety Research

NIJ is particularly interested in applications that address the following:

School Resource Officers

Many questions surround the activities and functions of school resource officers (SROs), other law enforcement, and security officers (hereafter referred to as SROs) who operate/coordinate with schools. The body of research on the effectiveness of SRO programs is limited, both by the number of studies and by the rigor of the studies that have been conducted. The research that is available draws conflicting conclusions about whether SRO programs are effective at reducing school violence and/or if additional SROs result in more children being placed in the criminal justice system. NIJ seeks applications that will lead to the development and implementation of trainings and/or tools that will significantly improve the work of SROs. NIJ is interested in research that will answer the following questions:

- What criteria are used to identify and select law enforcement officers to serve as SROs? What tools or strategies should be used in screening officers to become SROs?

- How are SROs and other law enforcement officers trained to work in K-12 public schools? What types of training should SROs receive that would equip them to

understand child development, disabilities issues, and trauma so that they are able to effectively work with students? How does their training compare to their day-to-day activities? What training delivery method is most effective (e.g., online, episodic, in-person, follow-up coaching, mandatory trainings, voluntary interest based training)?

- How are the activities of the SRO and other law enforcement officers being documented, beyond documentation of arrests? Which entity (for example, the LEA or the police department) is responsible for documenting those activities?

- How should SROs' performance be evaluated by their agency, the school and the communities they serve?

- To what extent are SROs and other law enforcement officers involved in addressing school disciplinary matters that do not rise to the level of criminal or delinquent activity? How are those situations handled? Who initiates SRO involvement and why?

- Are there differences in SRO turnover, discipline disparities, or arrest rates when comparing school districts that have their own police departments with school districts that have MOUs or contracts with local law enforcement agencies, or school districts that do not have formal arrangements with local law enforcement?

- Do SRO assignment patterns (assigned to one school, assigned to several schools, roving, assigned to a "beat") affect SRO turnover, discipline disparities, or arrest rates?

- For SRO programs that are implementing fines, fees or civil citations in a program of graduated sanctions, what is the impact of those sanctions on school based arrest rates?

Implicit Bias, School Discipline, and School Coordination with the Criminal Justice System

Developing positive school climate and refining school discipline policies and practices are critical steps to improving academic achievement and supporting student safety and success. The U.S. Department of Education has analyzed its Civil Rights Data Collection (CRDC) and found that youth of color and youth with disabilities are disproportionately impacted by suspensions and expulsions.[8] They are more than three times as likely as their white peers without disabilities to be expelled and suspended. These data also demonstrate that these pushouts begin as early as pre-school. In addition to suspension and expulsion, recent examinations of the CRDC demonstrate that black children, boys, and children with disabilities are disproportionately subject to corporal punishment in the 19 States that still allow this practice.[9] The experiences of corporal punishment and suspension, often beginning in the early elementary school years, may create pathways from school-to-prison. Relying on harsh discipline, suspensions and expulsions may not be compatible with creating a positive school climate and safe learning environment. The growing body of research on school discipline should inform locally developed approaches to identifying

[8] See http://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/school-discipline/data.html for more information on CRDC.
[9] A more thorough description of the use of corporal punishment in schools can be found in Gershoff, E.T. and Font, S. A. (2016) Corporal Punishment in U.S. Public Schools: Prevalence, Disparities in Use, and Status in State and Federal Policy. Social Policy Report, vol. 30, number 1.

factors that may lead to exclusionary school discipline, poor school climate and the school-to-prison pipeline.

- NIJ seeks proposals for a model school behavior and discipline data system that: (1) considers what information a school would need to collect (e.g., student demographic data, incident information, referral statistics, consequence data, information about SRO involvement, and outcomes information); (2) determines how best to collect it (including methods to standardize teacher and administrator data entry); (3) allows for layperson-friendly data analytics modeling so educators can understand and use their own discipline data; (4) includes and shares information as appropriate from other public agencies, while complying with FERPA, HIPAA, and other federal laws that implicate student privacy.

- NIJ encourages applicants to develop and evaluate innovative pilot programs that involve stakeholders — school districts, courts, law enforcement (including police, sheriff's departments, and district attorneys' offices), public defenders, family and child welfare system personnel, and communities (e.g., parents, students, local leaders) — working together to develop school-based protocols that allow for graduated sanctions for students' misbehavior and limit school-based arrests.

- NIJ similarly encourages applicants to develop and evaluate pilot programs that involve the stakeholders listed in the bullet above working together to build diversion programs that reduce misbehavior of students while (1) minimizing the severity of negative outcomes for students (e.g., arrest, out-of-home placement, secure detention, adjudication); (2) encouraging positive outcomes (counseling, community-based alternatives to secure programs);and (3) minimizing costs to schools and the justice system.

- NIJ seeks applications for studies that examine school pushouts (i.e., all of the reasons students are removed from the general education environment, regardless of educational justification). Such research might describe and analyze the spectrum of circumstances, consequences, and alternative education options available for students who experience school pushout, including, but not limited to, a self-contained classroom, in-school suspension, out-of-school suspension, an alternative school, a cyber-charter school, educational services during expulsion, a partial hospitalization program, a residential treatment facility, a juvenile justice facility, etc.

- In relation to implicit bias, school discipline, and the school-to-prison pipeline, NIJ seeks studies that explore the student voice and students' thoughts on these matters. How do students perceive justice system involvement in their schools and how are these perceptions related to their feelings about overall school safety?

<u>Disinvestment in Ineffective School Safety Programs</u>

- There is great effort invested in promoting the use of evidence-based programs/policies/practices (EBPs) and many schools do use EBPs to address school safety issues. However, the use of ineffective programs/policies/practices persists in schools at the same time as implementation of EBPs. Disinvestment in ineffective programs/policies/practices may help strengthen the use of EBPs. NIJ is

interested in the examination of several questions related to disinvestment in ineffective programs/policies/practices:

- What barriers to success exist when trying to implement evidence-based programs/practices in school safety?
- As a school incorporates EBPs to improve school safety, how does the use of programs and practices with no demonstrated effects, harmful effects, or limited benefits impact the use and/or outcomes of EBPs?
- What challenges occur when school systems try to disinvest in particular programs/practices/policies?

CSSI Funding Categories

NIJ is soliciting applications for CSSI funding in five categories. The first three categories are focused on developing knowledge about what works to make schools safe using a tiered evidence approach. The tiered evidence framework is based on a continuum of evidence that builds from early stage evaluations of innovative programs to highly rigorous evaluations of programs that are ready to scale-up. Increasing amounts of funding are awarded to programs of research according to their level of evidence effectiveness. In recent years, multiple federal grant making agencies (e.g., Department of Education, Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Labor) have used tiered evidence frameworks to build increasingly rigorous evidence on the effectiveness of youth programs.[10]

The three categories focused on developing knowledge through this tiered evidence approach are:

- Category 1 **Developing Novel and Innovative School Safety Programs, Practices, and Strategies**.
- Category 2 **Demonstration, Evaluation and Validation Tests for School Safety**.
- Category 3 **Expanding the use of Effective Interventions through Scaling-up**.

This solicitation will also include funding categories to support research on causes and consequences of school safety issues as well as assessments of school safety issues in tribal communities.

- Category 4 **Research on School Safety**.
- Category 5 **Understanding School Safety in Tribal Schools**.

Applications should feature close coordination involving SEAs or LEAs (including public charter schools that are recognized as LEAs) and a researcher or research organization that has considerable experience conducting research and evaluation, preferably, in school settings. NIJ

[10] The Youth.gov website provides summary information and links to federal programs that use a tiered evidence framework, including the Department of Education's Investing in Innovation Fund (i3) http://youth.gov/evidence-innovation/investing-evidence.

recommends that the research organization serve as the applicant and make one or more subawards to participating SEAs or LEAs.

The goal of the partnership should be to implement school safety activities that are paired with objective, high-quality research and evaluation activities with emphasis on fidelity to the implementation of the program and rigorous research designs. Coordination should be based on a formal agreement that demonstrates value placed upon open communication and the sharing of information and ideas. NIJ strongly encourages applicants to include appropriate letters of support in their applications. For applications selected for award, recipients should produce a formalized (i.e., written and fully-executed by authorized representatives of all parties) memorandum of understanding (MOU) or agreement that outlines the roles and responsibilities of all entities.

Applicants are strongly encouraged to review carefully the section entitled, "Budget and Associated Documentation" under Section D. Application and Submission Information, and its discussion of authorization and associated documentation required for any subawards.

Applicants for Categories 1-3 should:

- Dedicate up to 1/3 (one-third) of funding directly to research partners to develop and carry out a rigorous program of evaluation. No less than 2/3 (two-thirds) of funding should go towards the personnel, programs, equipment, materials, training, and other activities intended to advance school and student safety that will be subject to evaluation. A budget should be prepared for the full period of performance that clearly reflects the 1/3 and 2/3 split. See below in What an Application Should Include for more details on expectations and requirements.

- Incorporate findings from any local school climate and safety assessments and, as appropriate, plan to update or align activities with existing frameworks for promoting safe school climates and existing school emergency operations plans.

- Consider the availability and quality of local administrative data as it relates to school climate and school safety. An applicant may propose and evaluate improvements to relevant administrative data collection practices as part of the project design.

- Submit along with the application an administrative agreement or, at a minimum, a letter of support from all project partners. At a minimum, this is to include LEAs or SEAs and research partners, but it may also include behavioral and mental health service providers, law enforcement, courts, municipal government partners, and others as appropriate. If an award is made, recipients should submit a fully executed, written agreement between the relevant LEAs or SEAs and the research partner. This agreement should provide details on the roles and responsibilities of each party, and on what will be done to ensure that the independence and objectivity of the research is maintained.[11]

[11] An applicant, if funded, also must ensure, among other things, that any subaward has appropriate authorization, is clearly identified to the subrecipient, and includes all required information consistent with the Part 200 Uniform Requirements. See, e.g., 2 CFR 200.331. 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.

An applicant that intends to propose a project for which the primary purpose is to demonstrate and evaluate existing technologies, or develop, demonstrate, and evaluate innovative technologies should refer to NIJ's ***Research, Development, and Evaluation of Technologies to Improve School Safety*** solicitation. Please refer to that solicitation to determine the best fit for your application. NIJ will not review duplicate applications to this solicitation and the ***Research, Development, and Evaluation of Technologies to Improve School Safety*** solicitation and applicants are asked to submit the same project to only one of these.

Category 1: Developing Novel and Innovative School Safety Programs, Practices, and Strategies

Competition ID: NIJ-2017-11428

This category of the solicitation is aimed at providing scholars with an opportunity to develop new, innovative and evidence based programs, practices or strategies that have not yet undergone evaluation. The Developing Novel and Innovative School Safety Programs, Practices, and Strategies category is building on the foundation already established by NIJ's three previous years of funding for CSSI. Since 2014, NIJ has consistently funded projects aimed at developing knowledge on what works to make schools safe. However, NIJ has not funded many grants to support new program development activities. Some current CSSI projects are focused on improving previously existing programs, combining two or more programs, or assessing practices such as implementation of school resource officers and exclusionary discipline. NIJ has a strong interest in developing new programs that have the potential to improve school safety and reduce the potential harms associated with addressing school safety issues.

Applicants are encouraged to propose early-stage or exploratory research and evaluation projects to build evidence for novel and innovative school safety interventions. The innovation grants will support the development of interventions and pilot tests of the implementation of the developed interventions. This research may help to identify factors that are likely to mediate or moderate relationships between school safety activities and intended outcomes in particular settings or with particular populations. Innovation grants may also set the stage for more extensive or rigorous projects to follow; it may provide evidence for whether an intervention or strategy is ready to be subjected to a more rigorous efficacy or effectiveness evaluation.

The innovation grants applicants are required to propose a logic model that describes the operation of the program. The logic model should clearly articulate and operationalize the inputs, activities, and outcomes of the intervention program. Applicants will also be asked to articulate testable hypotheses that are firmly situated in the research literature.

Category 2: Demonstration, Evaluation and Validation Tests for School Safety

Competition ID: NIJ-2017-11429

The purpose of category 2 is to support demonstrations and evaluations of programs, practices, policies, and strategies designed to enhance school and student safety. This category most

closely resembles the “Developing Knowledge about What Works to Make Schools Safe” category from previous CSSI solicitations. However, in keeping with the focus on funding research based on a continuum of evidence, this category will solicit applications for funding for rigorous evaluations of interventions that have already undergone some evaluation and have demonstrated promise for enhancing school and student safety.

Applicants are asked to conduct independent evaluations of promising programs. They are also asked to develop the most robust research designs possible that will produce scientific evidence regarding the efficacy and cost/benefit of these programs. One example of a project that may be considered under this category is an evaluation of an intervention by an outside researcher when the program/model developer has evidence of positive outcomes via internal evaluations. Applicants may propose studies that test individual programs, practices, and strategies; or that test a combination of multiple approaches that have been previously evaluated. Applicants should consider 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. There is no requirement to study programs from a specified list, however, applicants are strongly encouraged to examine NIJ’s CrimeSolutions.gov, the Institute of Education Sciences What Works Clearinghouse, and various other “what works” repositories to identify promising programs and practices that may be ready for additional validation. Applicants should submit a clearly articulated logic model for the program, practice, or strategy that is proposed for evaluation and validation.

Category 3: Expanding the use of Effective Interventions through Scaling-up

Competition ID: NIJ-2017-11430

The purpose of category 3 is to expand and evaluate the implementation of interventions that have demonstrated positive results and have a strong evidence base. This category represents the final tier of evidence on the continuum of evidence. Interventions ready for scale-up will require strong evidence of proven effectiveness through multiple efficacy or effectiveness studies. Applicants in this category are encouraged to focus their efforts on specific interventions and expanding them beyond the school level to the district, regional, or State level. Applicants should provide a clear justification for the proposed scale of the project based on factors related to number of schools, number of students, characteristics of the program, evaluation design, and other issues as appropriate. The interventions must be ready for scale-up, in that training, materials, and other implementation support must be available at the time of application or must be proposed for development as part of the application.

Applicants should describe the intervention that will be scaled up, and provide the research evidence to demonstrate that the intervention is ready to go to scale. Key project participants (e.g., LEAs, SEAs) should provide letters of support indicating their willingness to participate in the implementation and the research associated with the project. Applicants may request resources including entering into an agreement with the program developer or training organization to facilitate the project. The program narrative should include a clearly articulated logic model. The logic model should identify and operationalize the inputs, activities, and outcomes of the intervention program. The program narrative should also include a sound implementation strategy, and a rigorous evaluation plan of that strategy. This plan should

provide a realistic foundation for implementation based on the implementation science literature and be flexible enough for the necessary adjustments that have to be made as scaling up proceeds.

Applicants are encouraged to consider basic principles in guiding the planning, analysis, and decision-making in these projects. First, be aware of system thinking. Expansion and institutionalization of interventions occurs in a complex network of interactions and influences, which should be taken into account in order to ensure scaling-up success. In school safety, systems thinking refers especially to the interrelationships between the intervention, trainers, schools, and the evaluation team. Striving for an appropriate balance among these elements is a major task in designing and implementing a scale-up strategy.

Second, scaling up must be concerned with sustainable policy and program development including attention to institutionalizing the intervention in policies, program guidelines, budgets, and other dimensions of the school system. In this regard, applicants are encouraged to include cost/benefit analysis in the proposal. Cost/benefit analysis is an effective way to communicate and disseminate findings from evaluation research and aids in decision-making.

Finally, these projects must assess scalability. Scalability refers to the ease or difficulty of scaling up the intervention, based on attributes of success which have previously been identified in research on implementation science and through practical experience. Applicants should consider carefully these important principles as they design the scale-up project.

Category 4: Research on School Safety

Competition ID: NIJ-2017-11431

The purpose of category 4 is to produce research findings with implications for school safety practice and policy with project periods of performance that are two-to-three years. This category is a combination of two categories from previous CSSI solicitations: “Causes and Consequences of School Violence” and the “Shorter Term Studies on School Safety.” In this category, NIJ is particularly interested in research that investigates common, but understudied practices and strategies related to school safety.

Projects under this category will support research to improve our understanding of the potential root causes and related factors that contribute to school violence, as well as the impact and consequences of school violence. The studies should have the potential to produce advances in theory, methodology, and/or understanding of important constructs with clear potential implications for policy or practice related to school and student safety. Studies will answer questions about why school violence occurs, where and when it occurs, who is involved, and how schools and people are affected. Applicants are encouraged to consider a variety of research questions and research methods to improve the understanding of violence in schools, among students, and directed at students. Studies that can be implemented within shorter timeframes might include high-quality case studies or mixed methods comparative research. They may incorporate key member interviews, focus groups, secondary data analysis, surveys, document analysis, and other methods focused on the challenges, opportunities, and lessons learned from efforts to increase school and student safety under different circumstances.

Category 5: Understanding School Safety Issues in Tribal Schools

Competition ID: NIJ-2017-11432

The purpose of category 5 is to assess school safety issues as they affect American Indian/Alaska Native (AI/AN) students and schools. NIJ is very interested in examining school safety issues in understudied communities and there is a dearth of research that systematically examines school safety in tribal schools or schools with high populations of AI/AN students.[12] A secondary objective of category 5 is to inform possible future investments in developing and testing school safety interventions in schools with high populations of AI/AN students.

AI/AN students face many unique challenges. According to the National Indian Education Association's (NIEA) *History of Natives in the American Education System* (2016):

- Violence and suicide are the first and second leading causes of death among AI/AN youth respectively. The suicide rate is 2.5 times the national rate for AI/AN students in the 15-24 year old age group.

- In Montana, AI/AN students are four times more likely to be expelled in comparison to their white peers.

- In Utah, AI/AN students are 7.5 times more likely to be expelled in comparison to their white peers.

- AI/AN students often live in isolated, rural areas, and some travel hundreds of miles to and from school.

- Approximately 90 percent of AI/AN students attend public schools, and thus face similar racial and ethnic disparities as other minority students.

- The AI/AN high school graduation rate is 69 percent — the lowest of any racial/ethnic demographic group across all schools. U.S. Department of Education data indicate that the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) schools fare even worse, with a graduation rate of 53 percent, compared to a national average of 83 percent.

According to the U.S. Government Accountability office (GAO), 33 percent of BIE schools were in poor physical condition.[13] Some of the schools are outdated — particularly when it comes to control and monitoring of campus access; through fencing, entrance design, entryway/exit accessibility, lighting and electronic monitoring of commons areas. Furthermore, most BIE

[12] According to the National Center for Education Statistics, there are approximately 522,000 AI/AN students enrolled in elementary and secondary schools in the U.S. http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d13/tables/dt13_203.50.asp. No more than 10 percent of those students attend BIE schools with the remaining attending public schools. NIJ seeks assessments of school safety needs for students attending schools with a high percentage of AI/AN students. NIJ leaves it up to the applicant to define a high population of AI/NA students and to justify the selection of SEAs or LEAs.
[13] Indian Affairs: Key Actions Needed to Ensure Safety and Health at Indian School Facilities. GAO-16-313. Washington, D.C.: March 2016.

schools do not have satellite phones or dedicated phone lines that can be used during an emergency (cell phone towers get overloaded during an emergency).

Under this funding category, NIJ intends to fund two-or-more projects to better understand the myriad issues that confront AI/AN students in BIE schools and in public schools on and off tribal lands. NIJ encourages applicants to examine the broader issues of school safety that are facing tribal schools including but not limited to:

- Exposure to violence and its impact on students, particularly school truancy and school climate. This may include development or validation of trauma screens for AI/AN youth for use in schools and other settings (juvenile justice, social service agencies, and mental health).

- Physical conditions of schools and the security needs of schools in rural areas.

- School climate in schools with a high population of AI/AN youth.

- Disparities in school discipline practices for AI/AN students.

- Coordination with law enforcement — both tribal law enforcement and local law enforcement.

- Access to mental and behavioral health services.

Applicants will be required to submit tribal resolution documentation prior to award. NIJ adheres to three principles that serve as the foundation of these research and evaluation activities. These principles require that research and evaluation projects for tribal youth provide practical results that are locally relevant; include local community members in the decision-making and implementation of the projects; and acknowledge and respect local customs, traditions, values, and history. Thus, NIJ encourages participatory approaches to developing and carrying out research with tribal populations. Research teams must demonstrate a strong capacity for working with AI/AN populations and in tribal settings.

Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products

The goal of this CSSI solicitation is to fund rigorous research that produces practical knowledge that can improve the safety of schools and students across the nation. This is accomplished through partnerships involving educators, researchers, and other stakeholders (e.g., law enforcement, behavioral, and mental health professionals) working toward the following objectives:

- Increasing scientific knowledge about the root causes, characteristics, and consequences of school violence and other threats to school and student safety.

- Developing, supporting, and rigorously evaluating a wide range of school and student safety programs, practices, and strategies.

- Developing a comprehensive school safety framework based on the best available information and evidence and testing it in selected school districts.

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

In addition to these deliverables (and the required reports[14] 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 set out in the table immediately below.

Performance Measures

Objective	Performance Measure(s)	Data Recipient Provides
Conduct research in science, technology, engineering, and/or mathematics having clear implications for criminal justice policy and practice in the United States.	1. Relevance to the needs of the field as measured by whether the project's substantive scope did not deviate from the funded project or any subsequent agency-approved modifications to the scope. 2. Quality of the research as demonstrated by the scholarly products that result in whole or in part from work funded under the NIJ award, such as published, peer-reviewed, scientific journal articles, and/or (as appropriate for the funded project) law review journal articles, book chapter(s) or book(s) in the academic press, technological prototypes, patented inventions, or similar scientific products. 3. Quality of management as measured by such factors as whether significant project milestones were achieved, reporting and other deadlines were met, and costs remained within approved limits.	1. Quarterly financial reports, semi-annual and final progress reports of the work performed under the NIJ award, and, 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.

[14] **Please note** that final reporting requirements differ in projects that involve program evaluations and those that do not.

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 propose meta-analysis of existing evaluation studies must establish clear inclusion criteria that favor and provide separate analysis of effect sizes for randomized and strong quasi-experimental studies. Applicants are encouraged to review evidence rating criteria on the CrimeSolutions.gov website for further information on high-quality evaluation design elements.

Applications that include evaluation research should consider 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 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. In all cases, applications are expected to propose the most rigorous evaluation design appropriate for the research questions to be addressed.

B. Federal Award Information

For **category 1**: NIJ estimates that a total of $7 million will become available. NIJ anticipates awards will be made in amounts up to $1 million with performance periods ranging from 24-48 months. NIJ expects to make awards in this category in the form of grants.

For **category 2**: NIJ estimates that a total of up to $19 million will become available. NIJ anticipates awards will be made in amounts ranging from $500,000 to $3 million with performance periods ranging from 24-48 months. NIJ expects to make awards in this category in the form of grants.

For **category 3**: NIJ estimates that a total of up to $21 million will become available. NIJ anticipates awards will be made in amounts ranging from $3 million to $7 million with performance periods ranging from 24-48 months. NIJ expects to make awards in this category in the form of grants.

For **category 4**: NIJ estimates that a total of up to $13 million will become available. NIJ anticipates that it will make awards in amounts ranging from $200,000 to $1 million with performance periods ranging from 24-36 months. NIJ expects to make awards in this category in the form of grants.

For **category 5**: NIJ estimates that a total of up to $2 million will become available. NIJ anticipates that it will make awards in amounts ranging from $500,000 up to $1 million with performance periods ranging from 24-48 months. NIJ expects to make awards in this category in the form of cooperative agreements.

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, 2018.

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 set out 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 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 2017, NIJ elects to fund only certain phases of a proposed project, the expected scholarly products from the partial-funding award may, in some cases, vary from those described above.)

NIJ may, in certain cases, provide additional funding in future years to awards made under its research, development, and evaluation solicitations, through supplemental awards. In making decisions regarding supplemental awards, NIJ will consider, among other factors, the availability of appropriations, 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 it will make any awards from funding categories 1, 2, 3, and 4 in the form of a grant. However, NIJ reserves the authority to make selected awards from categories 1, 2, 3, and 4 as cooperative agreements on a case-by-case basis, where NIJ determines that a cooperative agreement relationship is more appropriate for the implementation of the funded project.

NIJ expects that any award from category 5 under this solicitation will be made in the form of a cooperative agreement, which is a 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 2017 Awards" in the OJP Funding Resource Center.

Financial Management and System of Internal Controls

Award recipients and subrecipients (including recipients or subrecipients that are pass-through entities[15]) must, as described in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements[16] 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 here.

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 the categories of funding available in this specific solicitation.

[15] For purposes of this solicitation, the phrase "pass-through entity" includes any recipient or subrecipient that provides a subaward ("subgrant") to carry out part of the funded award or program.
[16] The "Part 200 Uniform Requirements" means the DOJ regulation at 2 C.F.R Part 2800, which adopts (with certain modifications) the provisions of 2 C.F.R. Part 200.

Supplanting

Federal funds must be used to supplement existing State, local, or tribal funds for program activities, and must not supplant those funds that have been appropriated for the same purpose. Supplanting will be reviewed during the application process, post-award monitoring, and audit. If reviewers think that supplanting may have occurred, then the applicant or recipient will be required to supply documentation demonstrating that the reduction in non-federal resources occurred for reasons other than the receipt or expected receipt of federal funds.

Applicants or recipients are expected to notify NIJ — in writing — promptly, in the event that the applicant or recipient identifies potential supplanting so that, as the circumstances may require, appropriate action(s) can be taken to avoid or address its occurrence.

To help clarify the difference between supplementing and supplanting, we provide the following example:

State funds are appropriated to hire 50 new police officers, and federal funds are awarded for hiring 60 new police officers. At the end of the year, the State has hired 60 new police officers, and the federal funds have been exhausted. The State has not used its funds towards hiring new officers, but instead reduced its appropriation for that purpose and assigned or appropriated the funds to another purpose. In this case, the State has supplanted its appropriation with the federal funds. If supplanting had not occurred, 110 new officers would have been hired using federal funds for 60 officers and State funds for 50 officers.

Participant Support Costs and Incentives for Social Science Research

NIJ has established policies concerning the use of reasonable and justified stipends (including travel costs) and incentives to support research integrity; please see Participant Support Costs and Incentives for Social Science Research at http://www.nij.gov/funding/Pages/research-participant-costs-and-incentives.aspx for guidance on requests for approval and proper tracking protocol.

Cost Sharing or Match 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 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% of the maximum annual salary payable to a member of the federal government's Senior Executive Service (SES) at an agency with a Certified SES Performance Appraisal System for that year.[17] The 2017 salary table for SES employees is available at the Office of Personnel Management website. Note: A recipient may compensate an employee at a greater rate, provided the amount in excess of this compensation limitation is paid with non-federal funds. (Non-federal funds used for any such additional compensation will not be considered matching funds, where match requirements apply.) If only a portion of an employee's time is charged to an OJP award, the maximum allowable compensation is equal to the percentage of time worked times the maximum salary limitation.

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

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

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

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

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

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 2017 Awards" in the OJP Funding Resource Center.

C. Eligibility Information

For eligibility information, see the 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.) An applicant may combine the Budget Narrative and the Budget Detail Worksheet in one document. However, if an applicant submits only one budget document, it must contain **both** narrative and detail information. Please review the "Note on File Names and File Types" under How to Apply to be sure applications are submitted in permitted formats.

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

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. Current OJP award recipients, when completing the field for "Legal Name" 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. On the SF-424, enter the Legal Name in box 5 and Employer Identification Number (EIN) in box 6 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 the Official Legal Name and address of the applicant entity in box 5 and the EIN in box 6 of the SF-424. An applicant must attach official legal documents to its application (e.g., articles of incorporation, 501C3, etc.) to confirm the legal name, address, and EIN entered into the SF-424.

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 should be—

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

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

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

3. Program Narrative

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

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

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

Program Narrative Guidelines:

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

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

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

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

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.
- Project Design and Implementation.
- Potential Impact.
- Capabilities/Competencies.

Within these sections, the narrative should address:

- Purpose, goals, and objectives.
- Review of relevant literature.

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

- Detailed description of research design and methods, such as research questions, hypotheses, description of sample, and analysis plan.

- Planned Scholarly Products (See Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products under Program-Specific Information, above, for a discussion of expected scholarly products.)

- Implications for criminal justice policy and practice in the United States.

- Management plan and organization.

- Plan for Dissemination to Broader Audiences (if applicable to the proposed project). Applicants should identify plans (if any) to produce or to make available to broader interested audiences — such as criminal/juvenile justice (and other related fields) practitioners or policymakers — summary information from the planned scholarly products of the proposed project (such as summaries or translational materials of articles in peer-reviewed scientific journals), in a form designed to be readily accessible and useful to those audiences. (Such dissemination might include, for example, trade press articles and webinars.)

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 resumes of the principal investigator and any and all co-principal investigators. In addition, curriculum vitae, resumes, 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 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 titled "Proposed non-competitive procurement contracts."

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

- Proposed project timeline and expected milestones

- Human Subjects Protection paperwork (documentation and forms related to Institutional Review Board (IRB) review). (See nij.gov/funding/humansubjects/Pages/welcome.aspx) **Note**: Final IRB approval is not required at the time an application is submitted.

- Privacy Certificate (for further guidance go to nij.gov/funding/humansubjects/pages/confidentiality.aspx)

- List of any previous and current NIJ awards to the applicant and investigator(s), including the NIJ-assigned award numbers and a brief description of any scholarly products that resulted in whole or in part from work funded under the NIJ award(s). (See "Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products" under "Program-Specific Information," above, for definition of "scholarly products.")

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

- List of other agencies, organizations, or funding sources to which this application has been submitted (if applicable)

- Data archiving plan. Applicants should anticipate that NIJ will require (through special award conditions, which may include a partial withholding of award funds) that data sets resulting in whole or in part from projects funded under this solicitation be submitted for archiving with the NACJD (See www.nij.gov/funding/data-resources-program/applying/Pages/data-archiving-strategies.aspx)

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

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

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

4. Budget and Associated Documentation

a. Budget Detail Worksheet

A sample Budget Detail Worksheet can be found at www.ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/BudgetDetailWorksheet.pdf. An applicant that submits its budget in a different format should use the budget categories listed in the sample budget worksheet. (An applicant should include in the budget work associated with satisfying data archiving requirements.) NIJ expects applicants to provide a thorough narrative for each section of the Budget Detail Worksheet. The Budget Detail Worksheet should break out costs by year.

For questions pertaining to budget and examples of allowable and unallowable costs, see the DOJ Grants Financial Guide.

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 — for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements — a particular agreement between a recipient and a third party will be considered a "subaward" or instead considered a procurement "contract" under the award is determined by federal rules and applicable OJP guidance. It is an important distinction, in part because the federal administrative rules and requirements that apply to "subawards" and procurement "contracts" under awards differ markedly.

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.

Additional guidance on the circumstances under which (for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements) an agreement constitutes a subaward as opposed to a procurement contract under an award, is available (along with other resources) on the OJP Part 200 Uniform Requirements web page.

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 application as approved by OJP. If, however, a particular subaward is not authorized by federal statute or regulation, and is not sufficiently described and justified in the application as approved by OJP, the recipient will be required, post-award, to request and obtain written authorization from OJP before it may make the subaward.

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

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

Unlike a recipient contemplating a subaward, a recipient of an OJP award generally does not need specific prior federal authorization to enter into an agreement that — for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements — is considered a procurement contract, **provided that** (1) the recipient uses its own documented procurement procedures and (2) those procedures conform to applicable federal law, including the Procurement Standards of the (DOJ) Part 200 Uniform Requirements (as set out at 2 C.F.R. 200.317 - 200.326). The Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative should identify proposed procurement contracts. (As discussed above, subawards must be identified and described separately from procurement contracts.)

The Procurement Standards in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements, however, reflect a general expectation that agreements that (for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements) constitute procurement “contracts” under awards will be entered into on the basis of full and open competition. If a proposed procurement contract would exceed the simplified acquisition threshold — currently, $150,000 — a recipient of an OJP award may not proceed without competition unless and until the recipient receives specific advance authorization from OJP to use a non-competitive approach for the procurement.

An applicant that (at the time of its application) intends — without competition — to enter into a procurement contract that would exceed $150,000 should include a detailed justification that explains to OJP why, in the particular circumstances, it is appropriate to

proceed without competition. Various considerations that may be pertinent to the justification are outlined in the DOJ Grants Financial Guide.

e. Pre-Agreement Costs

For information on pre-agreement 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 (that is, 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 (that is, 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 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 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 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.)

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 applicant (other than an individual applying in his/her personal capacity) is to download, complete, and submit the OJP Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire, as part of its application.

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). An applicant that does not expend any funds for lobbying activities is to enter "N/A" in the text boxes for item 10 ("a. Name and Address of Lobbying Registrant" and "b. Individuals Performing Services").

9. Additional Attachments

a. Applicant disclosure of pending applications[19]

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)

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

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 any inappropriate duplication of funding. Leveraging multiple funding sources in a complementary manner to implement comprehensive programs or projects is encouraged and is not seen as inappropriate duplication.

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

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

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

SAMPLE

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

Any applicant that does not have any pending applications as described above is to submit, as a separate attachment, a statement to this effect: "[Applicant Name on SF-424] does not have (and is not proposed as a subrecipient under) any pending applications submitted within the last 12 months for federally-funded grants or cooperative agreements or for subawards under federal grants or cooperative agreements) that request funding to support the same project being proposed in this

application to OJP and that would cover the identical cost items outlined in the budget submitted as part of this application."

b. Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity

When an application proposes research (including research and development) and/or evaluation, the applicant must demonstrate research/evaluation independence and integrity, including appropriate safeguards, before it may receive award funds. The applicant must demonstrate independence and integrity regarding both this proposed research and/or evaluation, and any current or prior related projects.

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

i. For purposes of this solicitation, each applicant is to document research and evaluation independence and integrity by including one of the following two items:

   a. A specific assurance that the applicant has reviewed its application to identify any actual or potential apparent conflicts of interest (including through review of pertinent information on the principal investigator, any co-principal investigators, and any subrecipients), and that the applicant has identified no such conflicts of interest – whether personal or financial or organizational (including on the part of the applicant entity or on the part of staff, investigators, or subrecipients) – that could affect the independence or integrity of the research, including the design, conduct, and reporting of the research.

   OR

   b. A specific description of actual or potential apparent conflicts of interest that the applicant has identified – including through review of pertinent information on the principal investigator, any co-principal investigators, and any subrecipients – that could affect the independence or integrity of the research, including the design, conduct, or reporting of the research. These conflicts may be personal (e.g., on the part of investigators or other staff), financial, or organizational (related to the applicant or any subrecipient entity). Some examples of potential investigator (or other personal) conflict situations are those in which an investigator would be in a position to evaluate a spouse's work product (actual conflict), or an investigator would be in a position to evaluate the work of a former or current colleague (potential apparent conflict). With regard to potential organizational conflicts of interest, as one example, generally an organization would not be given an award to evaluate a project, if that organization had itself provided substantial prior technical assistance to that specific project or a location implementing the project (whether funded by OJP or other sources), because the organization in such an instance might appear to be evaluating the effectiveness of its own prior work. The key is whether a reasonable person understanding all of the facts would be able to have confidence that the results of any research or evaluation project are objective and reliable. Any outside personal or financial interest that casts doubt on that objectivity and reliability of an evaluation or research product is a problem and must be disclosed.

ii. In addition, for purposes of this solicitation, each applicant is to address possible mitigation of research integrity concerns by including, at a minimum, one of the following two items:

a. If an applicant reasonably believes that no actual or potential apparent conflicts of interest (personal, financial, or organizational) exist, then the applicant should provide a brief narrative explanation of how and why it reached that conclusion. The applicant also is to include an explanation of the specific processes and procedures that the applicant has in place, or will put in place, to identify and prevent (or, at the very least, mitigate) any such conflicts of interest pertinent to the funded project during the period of performance. Documentation that may be helpful in this regard may include organizational codes of ethics/conduct and policies regarding organizational, personal, and financial conflicts of interest. There is no guarantee that the plan, if any, will be accepted as proposed.

OR

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

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

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 www.Grants.gov. 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. 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. Please ensure that all required documents are attached in either Grants.gov category.

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	Special Characters		
Upper case (A – Z)	Parenthesis ( )	Curly braces { }	Square brackets [ ]
Lower case (a – z)	Ampersand (&)	Tilde (~)	Exclamation point (!)
Underscore (__)	Comma (,)	Semicolon (;)	Apostrophe (')
Hyphen (-)	At sign (@)	Number sign (#)	Dollar sign ($)
Space	Percent sign (%)	Plus sign (+)	Equal sign (=)
Period (.)	**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:

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. If an applicant entity has not fully complied with 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.

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.)

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

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.

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

2. **Acquire registration with the System for Award Management (SAM).** SAM is the repository for certain standard information about federal financial assistance applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. All applicants for OJP awards (other than individuals) must maintain current registrations in the SAM database. An applicant must be registered in SAM to successfully register in Grants.gov. Each applicant must **update or renew its SAM registration at least annually** to maintain an active status. SAM registration and renewal can take as long as 10 business days to complete.

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

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

3. **Acquire an Authorized Organization Representative (AOR) and a Grants.gov username and password.** Complete the AOR profile on Grants.gov and create a username and password. An applicant entity's "unique entity identifier" (DUNS number) must be used to complete this step. For more information about the registration process for organizations and other entities, go to https://apply07.grants.gov/apply/OrcRegisterIndividuals registering with Grants.gov should go to http://www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants/individual-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, titled "National Institute of Justice Research, Evaluation, and Development Project Grants" and the funding opportunity number is NIJ-2017-11147.

6. **Select the correct Competition ID.** Some OJP solicitations posted to Grants.gov contain multiple purpose areas, denoted by the individual Competition ID. If applying to a solicitation with multiple Competition IDs, select the appropriate Competition ID for the intended purpose area of the application.

    - Category 1: Developing Novel and Innovative School Safety Programs, Practices, and Strategies – NIJ-2017-11428
    - Category 2: Demonstration, Evaluation and Validation Tests for School Safety – NIJ-2017-11429
    - Category 3: Expanding the use of Effective Interventions through Scaling-up – NIJ-2017-11430
    - Category 4: Research on School Safety – NIJ-2017-11431
    - Category 5: Understanding School Safety Issues in Tribal Schools – NIJ-2017-11432

7. **Submit a valid application consistent with this solicitation by following the directions in Grants.gov.** Within 24-48 hours after submitting the electronic application, the applicant should receive two notifications from Grants.gov. The first will confirm the receipt of the application. The second will state whether the application has been validated and successfully submitted, or whether it has been rejected due to errors, with an explanation. It is possible to first receive a message indicating that the application is received, and then receive a rejection notice a few minutes or hours later. Submitting an application well ahead of the deadline provides time to correct the problem(s) that caused the rejection. **Important:** OJP urges each applicant to submit its application **at least 72 hours prior** to the application due date, to allow time to receive validation messages or rejection notifications from Grants.gov, and to correct in a timely fashion any problems that may have caused a rejection notification. Applications must be successfully submitted through Grants.gov by 11: 59 p.m. eastern time on March 24, 2017.

Click here 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 or the SAM Help Desk (Federal Service Desk) 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 web page.

E. Application Review Information

Review Criteria

Applications that meet basic minimum requirements will be evaluated by peer reviewers using the following review criteria.

Statement of the Problem (Understanding of the problem and its importance) – 10%

1. Demonstrated understanding of the problem.
2. 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.

Potential Impact – 15%

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 manage the effort.

3. Relationship between the capabilities/competencies of the proposed project staff (including the applicant organization) and the scope of the proposed project.

Plan for Dissemination Strategy to broader audiences – 5%

Peer reviewers should 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 as well as practitioners in other, related fields, summary information from the planned scholarly products of the project.

1. Well-defined plan for the grant recipient to disseminate results to appropriate school safety audiences, including researchers, practitioners, and policymakers.

2. Suggestions for print and electronic products that NIJ should consider developing for school safety practitioners and policymakers.

3. If applicable, a clear strategy leading to the adoption into practice of any equipment or software.

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.

Review Process

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

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

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

For a list of the critical elements for this solicitation, see "What an Application Should Include" under Section D. Application and Submission Information.

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

Pursuant to the Part 200 Uniform Requirements, before award decisions are made, OJP also reviews information related to the degree of risk posed by applicants. Among other things to help assess whether an applicant that has one or more prior federal awards has a satisfactory record with respect to performance, integrity, and business ethics, OJP checks whether the

applicant is listed in SAM as excluded from receiving a federal award. In addition, if OJP anticipates that an award will exceed $150,000 in federal funds, OJP also must review and consider any information about the applicant that appears in the non-public segment of the integrity and performance system accessible through SAM (currently, the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System; "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 applicants."

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 management systems of the applicant, and applicant's ability to meet prescribed management standards, including those outlined in the DOJ Grants Financial Guide.

3. Applicant's history of performance under OJP and other DOJ awards (including scholarly products, and compliance with reporting requirements and award conditions), as well as awards from other federal agencies.

4. Reports and findings from audits of the applicant, including audits under the Part 200 Uniform Requirements

5. Applicant's ability to comply with statutory and regulatory requirements, and to effectively implement other award requirements

All final award decisions will be made by the Director of the National Institute of Justice, who may take into account not only peer review ratings and NIJ recommendations, but also other factors as indicated in this section.

F. Federal Award Administration Information

Federal Award Notices

Award notifications will be made by September 30, 2017. 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 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, regulations, and executive orders (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 2017 Awards", available in the OJP Funding Resource Center. 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.

- Certifications Regarding Lobbying; Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters; and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements.

- Standard Assurances.

Applicants may view these documents in the Apply section of the OJP Funding Resource Center.

The web pages accessible through the "Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2017 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 2017. 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 any award under this solicitation as either a grant or a cooperative agreement. A cooperative agreement will include a condition in the award document that sets out the "substantial federal involvement" in carrying out the award and program. Generally speaking, under cooperative agreements with OJP, 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 coordination efforts and site selection, as well as review and approval of work plans, research designs, data collection instruments, and major project-generated materials. In addition, OJP often indicates in the award condition that it may redirect the project if necessary.

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

General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements

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

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

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

Data on performance measures. In addition to required reports, each recipient of an award 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 recipient, post award, to provide the data listed as “Data Recipient Provides” in the performance measures table in Section A. Program Description, under "Performance Measures," so that OJP can calculate values for this solicitation's performance measures.

G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)

For questions directed to the Federal Awarding Agency (OJP), see NCJRS contact information on page 2.

For contact information for Grants.gov, see page 2.

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 applicant/recipient believes falls under a FOIA exemption, the specific exemption it believes applies, and why. After considering the submission by the applicant/recipient, OJP makes an independent assessment regarding withholding information. OJP generally follows a similar process for requests pursuant to FOIA for applications that may contain law-enforcement sensitive information.

Provide Feedback to OJP

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

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

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

Application Checklist

FY 2017 Comprehensive School Safety Initiative

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 36)
_____ Acquire or renew registration with SAM (see page 36)
To Register with Grants.gov:
_____ Acquire AOR and Grants.gov username/password (see page 36)
_____ Acquire AOR confirmation from the E-Biz POC (see page 36)
To Find Funding Opportunity:
_____ Search for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov (see page 36)
_____ Select the correct Competition ID (see page 37)
_____ Download Funding Opportunity and Application Package (see page 36)
_____ Sign up for Grants.gov email notifications (optional) (see page 35)
_____ 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 21)
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 37)
If no Grants.gov receipt, and validation or error notifications are received:
_____ See NCJRS contact information on the title page

Overview of Post-Award Legal Requirements:

_____ Review the "Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements – FY 2017 Awards" in the OJP Funding Resource Center.

Scope Requirement:

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

Eligibility Requirement: For eligibility information, see the title page.

What an Application Should Include:

_____ Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) (see page 22)
_____ Project Abstract (if applicable) (see page 23)
_____ Program Narrative (critical element) (see page 23)
_____ Budget Detail Worksheet (critical element) (see page 27)
_____ Budget Narrative (critical element) (see page 27)
_____ Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable) (see page 30)
_____ Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable) (see page 30)

_____ Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire (see page 31)
_____ Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL) (see page 31)
_____ Additional Attachments
  _____ Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications (see page 31)
  _____ Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity (see page 33)
  _____ CVs/Resumes of key personnel (critical element) (see page 25)
_____ Request and Justification for Employee Compensation; Waiver (if applicable) (see page 21)