

Notices regarding the solicitation “Research and Evaluation in Support of the Recommendations of the President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing”

April 1, 2016: NIJ modified how funds will be allocated under this funding opportunity. Funding under this opportunity per focus area will be allocated as such:

Focus Area	Topic	Value
I.	Building Trust and Legitimacy	\$2 million
II.	Technology and Social Media	\$2 million
III.	Training and Education	\$1 million
IV.	Officer Wellness and Safety	\$1.5 million

When applying under this funding opportunity, applicants should ensure they select the appropriate funding opportunity number corresponding to their desired focus area. Applications will only be reviewed in the categories in which they are received. Applications that are not responsive to the specific category area and applications that are submitted to a category in error will neither proceed to peer review nor receive further consideration.

The amount of funding available under this opportunity remains the same (\$6.5M).

March 23, 2016: 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 <http://nij.gov/funding/pages/solicitation-qa.aspx#NIJ-2016-9095> for questions and answers to help prepare your application.

The original solicitation document begins on the next page.



The [U.S. Department of Justice](#) (DOJ), [Office of Justice Programs](#) (OJP), [National Institute of Justice](#) (NIJ) is seeking applications for funding for research and evaluation in support of the recommendations of The President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing. This program furthers the Department's mission by sponsoring research to provide objective, independent, evidence-based knowledge and tools to meet the challenges of policing, particularly at the State, local, and tribal levels.

Research and Evaluation in Support of the Recommendations of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing

Applications Due: May 17, 2016

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. For-profit organizations must agree to forgo any profit or management fee. Foreign governments, foreign organizations, and foreign institutions of higher education are not eligible to apply.

NIJ welcomes applications that involve two or more entities that will carry out the funded federal award activities, however, one eligible entity must be the applicant and the other(s) must be proposed as subrecipient(s). The applicant must be the entity with primary responsibility for conducting and leading the project. If successful, the applicant will be responsible for monitoring and appropriately managing any subrecipients or, as applicable, for administering any procurement subcontracts that would receive federal program funds from the applicant under the award.

An eligible applicant may submit more than one application, as long as each application proposes a different project in response to the solicitation. (Applicants should also review and consider the "Duplicate Applications" note under [How to Apply](#) in Section D. Application and Submission Information.) Subrecipients may be part of multiple proposals.

NIJ may elect to make awards for applications submitted under this 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 to be submitted and in receipt of a successful validation message in Grants.gov by 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time on **May 17, 2016**.

All applicants are encouraged 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 hours of operation are 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, except federal holidays.

Applicants that experience unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond their control that prevent them from submitting their application by the deadline must email the NIJ contact identified below **within 24 hours after the application deadline** and request approval to submit their application. Additional information on reporting technical issues is found under "Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues" in the [How to Apply](#) section.

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

Grants.gov number assigned to this announcement: NIJ-2016-9095

Release date: February 17, 2016

Contents

A. Program Description	4
Overview	4
Program-Specific Information	5
Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products	12
B. Federal Award Information	13
Type of Award	13
Financial Management and System of Internal Controls.....	14
Budget Information	14
Cost Sharing or Matching Requirement	15
Pre-Agreement Cost (also known as Pre-award Cost) Approvals.....	15
Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver	15
Prior Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conference/Meeting/Training Costs	16
Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable)	16
C. Eligibility Information	16
Limit on Number of Application Submissions	16
D. Application and Submission Information	17
What an Application Should Include.....	17
How to Apply	28
E. Application Review Information	31
Selection Criteria	31
Review Process.....	32
F. Federal Award Administration Information.....	34
Federal Award Notices	34
Administrative, National Policy, and other Legal Requirements.....	34
General Information About Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements.....	35
G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)	36
H. Other Information	36
Provide Feedback to OJP	36
Application Checklist	37

Research and Evaluation in Support of the Recommendations of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing

(CFDA No. 16.560)

A. Program Description

Overview

As part of a multi-pronged strategy, NIJ is seeking research proposals to support the recommendations of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing. In December 2014, in response to a number of serious incidents between law enforcement and the communities that they serve, President Obama formed a task force to develop recommendations for meaningful solutions to help law enforcement agencies and communities strengthen trust and collaboration. The Executive Order appointed an 11-member task force on 21st century policing with the purpose of identifying best practices and providing recommendations on how policing practices can promote effective crime reduction while building public trust.

The task force – which was comprised of leaders from law enforcement, police unions, academia, civil rights organizations, and community members – identified six reforms or “pillars” that were deemed critical to improve current policing practices:

1. Building Trust and Legitimacy.
2. Policy and Oversight.
3. Technology and Social Media.
4. Community Policing and Crime Reduction.
5. Training and Education.
6. Officer Wellness and Safety.

The results and recommendations are detailed in the [Final Report of The President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing](#) published in May 2015. Applicants are strongly encouraged to review the report, as well as [The President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing Implementation Guide](#), which aims to move the recommendations into practice.

In support of the task force's recommendations and action items, NIJ has formed a comprehensive agenda around research on policing that improves policing practices, community relationships and partnerships, and officer and public safety at the State, local, and tribal levels. NIJ has formed a cross-office workgroup to implement a five-year plan which will address all six pillars with a combination of both intramural and extramural research activities. This research will build on other efforts at the Department of Justice to ensure that the criminal justice system is learning from the growing evidence base around the Task Force's pillars, including work by the [Community Oriented Policing Office \(COPS\)](#) and the

Department's [National Initiative for Building Community Trust and Justice](#). It is anticipated that the results of these research projects will contribute to the body of knowledge of the NIJ policing agenda and inform future research.

Authorizing Legislation: Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (sections 201 and 202).

Program-Specific Information

The solicitation includes four foci that reflect four of the six pillars identified by the task force. Applicants are required to identify the focus area to which they are applying. Applications will only be reviewed in the categories in which they are received. Applications that are not responsive to the specific category area and applications that are submitted to a category in error will be removed from competition.

Focus I: Building Trust and Legitimacy

Competition ID: NIJ-2016-9395

Under Focus I, NIJ will support research that develops a knowledge base for improving and nurturing trust and legitimacy on both sides of the police/citizen divide. While NIJ will support general research topics identified in the implementation guide, NIJ is specifically interested in supporting research on community- and problem-oriented policing. While community-oriented policing (COP) has seen widespread adoption and federal support to expand,¹ there are still many areas that warrant further research in order to understand how COP has evolved and its effectiveness at addressing two critical issues in policing today. NIJ is interested in research on how COP (and similar strategies) can be used to build police-community relationships and if it can help address counter-terrorism and broader community security challenges. **Applicants under Focus I should choose to propose projects under either item a. or b. below:**

a. Strategies to Build and Strengthen Police-Community Relationships: Trust

Recent events across the nation suggest that relationships between the police and community members in a number of jurisdictions may be at a crossroads. Police-involved shootings and other negative exchanges between community members and the police have brought heightened awareness to the current state of police-community relationships. Although some of the earliest principles of policing emphasized the belief that the police and community members were partners in the production of public safety, current events suggest the strength of these relationships have weakened. Strong relationships between the police and residents they serve are vital in maintaining public safety. Accordingly, more research is needed to examine areas where the police and community members could make improvements to strengthen trust and confidence during the course of citizen-initiated calls for police service or police-initiated contacts.

¹ Chappell, A. (2009). The Philosophical versus Actual Adoption of Community Policing. *Criminal Justice Review* 34:5-28.

b. Strategies to Build and Strengthen Police-Community Relationships: Addressing Threats of Terrorism

Modern policing in the post 9-11 era has experienced a massive evolution in responding to basic public safety. In the past couple of decades, State and local law enforcement agencies have had to absorb an increasing list of national security-related tasks. Countering domestic radicalization, protecting their communities from lone wolf attacks, and highly organized international terrorism are now common areas of concern for both large and small policing jurisdictions.² These issues and the strategies adopted to address them have placed increasing strains on State and local law enforcement agencies in terms of human resources, as well as training and equipment costs. Many now are calling for a return to the basic tenants of community policing as a way to mitigate these dangers with less resource requirements. The majority of police chiefs view homeland security and community-oriented policing as compatible, with its emphasis on problem solving and community relationships as helping to avert terrorist attacks.³

Consequently, NIJ is interested in research on the effectiveness of community policing to address the threat of terrorism. Specific research topics may include:

- The congruence of COP strategies and homeland security initiatives.
- The actual application of COP strategies currently deployed in the field.
- An analysis of prevented versus actual attacks and the role COP strategies may have played in combating these attacks.
- The impact of terrorism on policing agencies and how policing agencies are coping with increasing demands.
- How federal initiatives to counter these issues (e.g., countering violent extremism or anti-human trafficking task forces, federal equipment grant programs such as the FEMA Homeland Security Grant Program) are affecting other policing requirements.

Focus II: Technology and Social Media

Competition ID: NIJ-2016-9396

Under Focus II, NIJ will support research that involves the implementation, use, and evaluation of technology and social media by law enforcement agencies. **Applicants under Focus II should choose to propose projects under either item a. or b. below:**

a. Research to Support Impact of Police Technology

Over the last two decades, advances in technology have resulted in significant changes in policing in the United States. Advancements in technologies such as automated vehicle locators, crime mapping applications, license plate recognition, video surveillance cameras,

² Burruss, G., J. Schafer, and M. Giblin. (2012). Homeland Security in Small Law Enforcement Jurisdictions: Preparedness, Efficacy, and Proximity to Big-City Peers. Washington, D.C.: The National Institute of Justice.

³ Chappell, A. and S. Gibson. (2009). Community Policing and Homeland Security Policing: Friend or Foe? *Criminal Justice Policy Review* 20: 326-343.

less-lethal weapons, police use of force simulators, body-worn cameras, unmanned aerial vehicles, social media, and mobile phones with enhanced investigative functions have changed American policing. Despite the promise that technologies offer, implementation is likely to impact the police agency. For example, the adoption of new technologies may impact recruiting, training, or the need for changes in agency policies and procedures governing the use of those technologies. New tools or technologies may also have a positive impact on a police department, but produce unanticipated outcomes in the community. For example, the implementation of technology may increase officer effectiveness but damage relationships between the police and community residents.

To support research under this topical area, NIJ is interested in research that examines the impact of various technologies on policing. Proposals should also evaluate the impact of these technologies on crime control outcomes as well as provide a cost/benefit analysis to examine the impact of the adoption of these technologies on existing police resources. NIJ is specifically interested in the impact of technology on the following areas:

- Citizen perceptions of police.
- Police-community relationships.
- Police training.
- De-escalation strategies surrounding the use of force.
- Outcomes in criminal cases.
- Assisting with criminal investigations.

b. Research on Evidence in Forensic Laboratories

To complement the focus on outcomes in criminal cases and assisting with criminal investigations, NIJ is also interested in research on reducing DNA backlogs, specifically in triaging evidence submission to forensic laboratories. As DNA technology has advanced, there have been vast improvements to the criminal justice system. As a result of DNA testing, there has been a change in how we view the potential for wrongful convictions, how cases are investigated, and the benefits of testing DNA from property crimes, cold cases, and sexual assault kits. Among other things, the evidentiary value of testing evidence for DNA has created demand that continues to outpace laboratory capacity resulting in extensive backlogs of DNA evidence – in many cases turnaround times are reported to be several months and even more than one year. The delay in processing DNA evidence has direct negative implications on the entire criminal justice system creating a national concern.

Police are tasked with making decisions on how to triage evidence submitted for forensic testing, but there is very limited understanding on the efficacy of different policies. Some jurisdictions have policies that only allow investigators to request DNA testing of three-to-five items of evidence per submission. Other jurisdictions do not have any restrictions on the number of items of evidence submitted at any one time.

NIJ is interested in receiving innovative proposals for research designed to evaluate the efficacy of the protocols that police and investigators can use to triage DNA evidence collected at crime

scenes and submitted to forensic laboratories against metrics such as the average turnaround time per case for a forensic analysis; the burden on police investigations with respect to time and effort; how cases are prosecuted; and the number of DNA profiles uploaded into the National DNA Index System (NDIS), commonly referred to as the Combined DNA Index System (CODIS).

Focus III: Training and Education

Competition ID: NIJ-2016-9397

Under Focus III, NIJ will support research that focuses on law enforcement training and education. Police training has grown exponentially since the late 1960s;⁴ at the same time, changes in the nature of policing have resulted in an increase in the duties and responsibilities of police officers on the street. Few studies, however, have evaluated the impact of such training programs on actual police job performance. Past evaluations have been limited to examining whether more training produces a desired change in police practice. Studies and evaluations of police training programs have produced limited findings due to their failure to take into account the complexities of effective training programs such as content, instructor qualification, timing, simulation methods, dosage levels, and long-term effects. To promote a broader look at police training and education, NIJ is interested in research on the curriculum as a whole, and how effective training programs are at addressing specific police issues. Proposed subtopics and research questions are below. **Applicants under Focus III should choose to propose projects under either item a., b. or c. below:**

a. Police Academy Curriculum

In the past, the policing profession has often turned to training and education in an effort to professionalize its workforce, address issues of ineffectiveness and misconduct, and adapt to the challenges of new technology and evolving threats to public safety. Yet while police training has evolved significantly in recent times, the current fiscal state of many agencies have required them to cut back on training delivery. One result is that many recruits now attend police academies on their own and then seek employment.⁵ While resources dedicated towards training and education are shrinking, many are calling for a closer look at the police academy curriculum as a vehicle to bring about reforms to the policing culture. Some researchers have characterized the current curriculum as “conflict-based” and are currently advocating a shift to public servant or “problem-solving” orientation to the police academy curriculum.⁶

NIJ is interested in knowing more about the current state of the police academy as a whole, including field training for new recruits. This body of knowledge is critical to see how training and education is adapting to meet the current needs in spite of fiscal and other resource challenges that agencies face in developing a robust training program. It is also important to understand how training in areas such as these improve police practices. Without this knowledge, it may be difficult to implement reforms that rely on changes to training. NIJ is soliciting research on police

⁴ National Research Council. (2004). *Fairness and Effectiveness in Policing: The Evidence*. Committee to Review Research on Police Policy and Practices. Wesley Skogan and Kathleen Frydl, editors. Committee on Law and Justice, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, D.C.: The National Academy Press.

⁵ See Cordner, G and C. Shain. (2011). The Changing Landscape of Police Education and Training. *Police Practice and Research*. 12:281-285.

⁶ Vander Kooi, G and L. Bierlein. (2014). Problem-based Learning for Police Academy Students: Comparison of Those Receiving Such Instruction with Those in Traditional Programs. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* 25:175-195.

training that may include the academy curriculum as a whole, and the influence of research on academy curricula.

Successful applicants will submit research designs that can isolate the influence of training of new recruits from any shared attributes individuals have that select law enforcement as a profession.

b. Crisis Intervention Training on Dealing With the Mentally Ill

Over the last decade, a disproportionate number of individuals with mental illnesses have become involved in some manner with the criminal justice system. Not surprisingly, the police have been required to resolve an increasing number of situations involving mentally ill individuals. As a result of a decrease in community resources needed to treat the mentally ill, the ability of the police to refer individuals in need of treatment services has become limited;⁷ however, their role in the successful resolution of situations involving the mentally ill is critical. Proper training is important given the problematic nature involved in calls for service for people experiencing some form of mental health crisis where police intervention is required. Police officers may think they are inadequately trained to deal with mentally ill individuals and have only their traditional training to rely upon in such encounters. Given the unpredictable and potentially dangerous nature in such incidents, officers may unintentionally make the situation worse because of perceptions of fear or a reflexive reaction to control the situation and gain compliance from the individual. Thus, the unintended escalation of the incident could, in turn, result in a negative outcome. In response to the need to deal with this population, many police departments have adopted training programs for officers on how to deal with individuals with mental health issues. These programs provide training to police officers to teach them how to defuse potentially volatile situations and to treat people who suffer from psychiatric illnesses with respect. Programs such as the Memphis Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) model were created to increase officer safety in encounters involving the mentally ill and allow for the opportunity, when deemed appropriate, for the diversion of mentally ill individuals from the criminal justice system to mental health treatment.⁸ The training module consists of 40 hours of specialized curriculum that includes information on indicators of signs and symptoms of mental illness, proper mental health treatment options, and de-escalation techniques that officers can use to diffuse certain situations. NIJ is interested in research that focuses on the evaluation of CIT training programs that are adopted, implemented, and deployed in the field to resolve situations involving the police and the mentally ill. Specific research questions may include:

- Do critical-incident training or crisis-intervention training result in fewer use of force encounters between police and persons in crisis?
- Do critical incident training or crisis-intervention training result in fewer arrests and increases in medical services referrals or hospitalizations being made by police in such encounters?
- Do CIT programs have a diffuse impact on citizen perceptions of police legitimacy?
- To what degree is training technology incorporated into CIT programs, and what is its impact on the efficacy of training programs?

⁷ Watson, A. C., & Fulambarker, A.J. (2012). The Crisis Intervention Team Model of Police Response to Mental Health Crises: A Primer for Mental Health Practitioners. *Best Practices in Mental Health*, 8(2): 71.

⁸ Ibid.

c. Research on Training and Education on Police Use of Force

In response to a number of high-profile use of force incidents by police across jurisdictions, citizens have questioned the behavior of the police in these situations, and suggested that the decision to use force by the police was either excessive or unnecessary. Often resulting in protests, the chief concerns are centered on the belief that these incidents are the result of police officers who are either poorly-trained or are not adequately disciplined for their behavior in situations where excessive or unnecessary force was used. In response to these incidents, police executives are evaluating whether training on the use of force should be “re-engineered” in a manner that will give officers additional skills and tools beyond those offered by traditional training to avoid the unnecessary use of force. A number of police leaders note that improvements in police training on use of force may need to be preceded by changes in aspects of policing such as police culture, organizational philosophies governing the use of force, and revisions to current use of force policies. As a result of these changes, a number of police agencies have adopted use of force curriculums that include training on de-escalation tactics, tactical disengagement, communication skills and critical thinking, and scenario-based situations. NIJ is interested in research that will evaluate the impact of training on police use of force decision making. Specific research questions may include:

- Does training on de-escalation or other alternative police tactics result in fewer use of force outcomes in police-citizen encounters?
- Do use of force training programs reduce injuries to officers, suspects, and/or bystanders?
- To what degree is training technology incorporated into use of force training programs and what is its impact on the efficacy of the training program?
- What is the impact of use of force training on officer perceptions?
- What is the impact of use of force training on officer decision making?

Focus IV: Officer Wellness and Safety

Competition ID: NIJ-2016-9398

Under Focus IV, NIJ will support research that addresses wellness and safety of law enforcement officers, which is critical to public safety and a priority area for NIJ. This has been one of the core aspects of NIJ’s policing portfolio and NIJ and the Department of Justice have supported several programs of research in the area of officer safety and wellness. This line of research is dedicated to uncovering factors that contribute to threats to officer wellness and informing agencies of policy changes or new procedures to reduce these factors. While we have done extensive research on the impact of shift-length on officer fatigue and the factors likely leading to traffic fatalities, NIJ wants to enhance the officer safety and wellness portfolio to include more research on programs that reduce suicide and line-of-duty violence against police officers. Also, while NIJ has done previous work on stress related to operational conditions such as the shift duration,⁹ NIJ would like to expand the wellness portfolio to include job-related post-

⁹ See <http://www.nij.gov/topics/law-enforcement/officer-safety/stress-fatigue/Pages/sleep-disorders.aspx>.

traumatic stress issues and job-related stress issues in general. Law enforcement officers are at-risk for being involved in high-intensity stress incidents that may lead to post-traumatic stress; long-duration responses to crisis that may trigger first-responder fatigue;¹⁰ and caring for individuals that have experienced traumatic events; thus putting them at-risk for secondary traumatic stress.¹¹

In fiscal year 2015, NIJ initiated a systematic review of the literature regarding effective programs to mitigate the impact of post-traumatic stress and prevent law enforcement officer suicide. Yet there is still much to learn regarding these programs. Line-of-duty violence continues to contribute to a significant proportion of officer injuries and deaths.¹² NIJ would like to develop a greater understanding of efficacious programs to protect police officers from violence. Specific research questions may include:

- Are there particular job functions that lead to an increase of stress/depression?
- How prevalent is post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) in policing? Do particular police activities lead to PTSD apart from major critical events (e.g. shootings, serious injury)?
- How can police departments protect their officers from shootings and line-of-duty violence? In other words, are there common environmental or contextual conditions present in these shootings and line-of-duty violence (particular calls-for-service, controlled substances or mental health issues)?
- What promising tactics exist to prevent officer shootings and fatalities given the leading factors (different routines for engaging in traffic stops or staffing the reception desk at the district station)?

Researcher-Practitioner Partnerships

If applicants propose a researcher-practitioner partnership or if a practitioner or policy-based organization will be significantly involved in the proposed projects, applicants are encouraged to provide the following:

- A detailed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the practitioner or policy-based organization(s);
- A description of funding support for the practitioner or policy-based organization(s) or key staff; and
- A detailed communication and management plan that details the coordination plan for the project team and relevant partners.

At a minimum, applications must include a signed letter of support for all proposed partnerships. Post-award, MOUs must be signed by all relevant partners prior to the start of a

¹⁰ Lee, Clark. 2011. "Addressing Emergency Response Provider Fatigue in Emergency Response Preparedness, Management, Policy Making, and Research." *Journal of Emergency Management* 9:19-29.

¹¹ National Child Traumatic Stress Network. 2011. *Secondary Traumatic Stress" A Fact Sheet for Child-Serving Professionals*. NCTSN.org.

¹² *Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted 2014*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

project. In addition, applicants should consider an additional publication related to the successes and obstacles of the partnership in their respective project.

Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products

In addition to required data sets, interim and final progress and financial reports,¹³ 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.

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.

¹³ See "Federal Award Administration Information" ("General Information About Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements") section of this solicitation, below, for additional information.

B. Federal Award Information

NIJ anticipates that up to a total of \$6.5 million may become available for awards under this solicitation. Prospective applicants may propose projects with budgets as low as \$10,000. From the total amount, NIJ anticipates that it will make multiple awards for a project period of up to three years. Project periods and requested funding amounts should be commensurate with the time required to complete the proposed research and justified by the scope of work included in the program narrative.

To allow time for, among other things, any necessary post-award review, modification, and clearance by OJP of the proposed budget, applicants should propose an award start date of January 1, 2017.

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 length of project period—the amount or length anticipated for an individual award (or awards) under this solicitation.) Given limitations on the availability to NIJ of funds for research, development, and evaluation awards, this information will assist NIJ in considering whether partial funding of proposals that would not receive full funding would be productive. (If NIJ elects to fund only certain phases of a proposed project in FY 2016, the expected scholarly products from the partial-funding award may, in some cases, vary from those described above.)

NIJ may, in certain cases, provide supplemental funding in future years to awards under its research, development, and evaluation solicitations. Important considerations in decisions regarding supplemental funding include, among other factors, the availability of funding, strategic priorities, NIJ's assessment of the quality of the management of the award (for example, timeliness and quality of progress reports), and NIJ's assessment of 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 Award¹⁴

NIJ expects that it will make any award from this solicitation in the form of a grant or cooperative agreement. A cooperative agreement is a particular type of grant used if NIJ expects to have ongoing substantial involvement in award activities. Substantial involvement includes direct oversight and involvement with the grantee organization in implementation of the grant, but does not involve day-to-day project management. See [Administrative, National Policy, and other Legal Requirements](#), under [Section F. Federal Award Administration Information](#), for details regarding the federal involvement anticipated under an award from this solicitation.

As discussed [later in the solicitation](#), important rules (including limitations) apply to any conference/meeting/training costs under cooperative agreements.

¹⁴ See generally 31 U.S.C. §§ 6301-6305 (defines and describes various forms of federal assistance relationships, including grants and cooperative agreements [a type of grant]).

Please note: Any recipient of an award under this solicitation will be required to comply with Department of Justice regulations on confidentiality and human subjects' protection. See "Evidence, Research, and Evaluation Guidance and Requirements" under "Solicitation Requirements" in [OJP's Funding Resource Center](#).

Financial Management and System of Internal Controls

Award recipients and subrecipients (including any recipient or subrecipient funded in response to this solicitation that is a pass-through entity¹⁵) must, as described in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements 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.

In order to better understand administrative requirements and cost principles, applicants are encouraged to enroll, at no charge, in the Department of Justice Grants Financial Management Online Training available [here](#).

Budget Information

What will not be funded:

- Proposals 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.)

¹⁵ For purposes of this solicitation (or program announcement), "pass-through entity" includes any entity eligible to receive funding as a recipient or subrecipient under this solicitation (or program announcement) that, if funded, may make a subaward(s) to a subrecipient(s) to carry out part of the funded program.

- Proposals that are not responsive to this specific solicitation.
- Proposals that are not responsive to the specific solicitation category.

Cost Sharing or Matching Requirement

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

Pre-Agreement Cost (also known as Pre-award Cost) Approvals

Pre-agreement costs are costs incurred by the applicant prior to the start date of the period of performance of the grant 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. If approved, pre-agreement costs could be paid from grant funds consistent with a grantee’s approved budget, and under applicable cost standards. However, all such costs prior to award and prior to approval of the costs are incurred at the sole risk of an applicant. Generally, no applicant should incur project costs *before* submitting an application requesting federal funding for those costs. Should there be extenuating circumstances that appear to be appropriate for OJP’s consideration as pre-agreement costs, the applicant should contact the point of contact listed on the title page of this announcement for details on the requirements for submitting a written request for approval. See the section on [Costs Requiring Prior Approval](#) in the [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, recipients may not use federal funds to pay total cash compensation (salary plus cash bonuses) to any employee of the award 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.¹⁶ The 2016 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. (Any such additional compensation will not be considered matching funds where match requirements apply.) For employees who charge only a portion of their time to an award, the allowable amount to be charged 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, the limitation on compensation rates allowable under an award. An applicant requesting a waiver should include a detailed justification in the budget narrative of the application. Unless the applicant submits a waiver request and justification with the application, the applicant should anticipate that OJP will request the applicant to adjust and resubmit the budget.

¹⁶ OJP does not apply this limitation on the use of award funds to the nonprofit organizations listed at Appendix VIII to 2 C.F.R. Part 200.

The justification should include the particular qualifications and expertise of the individual, the uniqueness of the service the individual will provide, the individual's specific knowledge of the program or project being undertaken with award funds, and a statement explaining that the individual's salary is commensurate with the regular and customary rate for an individual with his/her qualifications and expertise, and for the work to be done.

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

OJP strongly encourages applicants that propose to use award funds for any conference-, meeting-, or training-related activity to review carefully—before submitting an application—the OJP policy and guidance on “conference” approval, planning, and reporting 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, including a general prohibition of all food and beverage costs.

Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable)

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

For additional information, see the "Civil Rights Compliance" section under “Solicitation Requirements” in [OJP's Funding Resource Center](#).

C. Eligibility Information

Eligibility

For additional eligibility information, see title page.

For additional information on cost sharing or matching requirements, see [Section B. Federal Award Information](#).

Limit on Number of Application Submissions

If an applicant submits multiple versions of the same application, NIJ will review only the most recent system-validated version submitted. For more information on system-validated versions, see [How to Apply](#).

D. Application and Submission Information

What an Application Should Include

Applicants should anticipate that if they fail to submit an application that contains all of the specified elements, it may affect negatively the review of their application; and, should a decision be made to make an award, it may result in the inclusion of special conditions that preclude the recipient from accessing or using award funds pending satisfaction of the conditions.

Moreover, applicants should anticipate that applications determined to be nonresponsive to the scope of the solicitation, or that do not include the application elements that NIJ has designated to be critical, will neither proceed to peer review nor receive further consideration. Under 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. 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,” “Résumés”) for all attachments. Also, OJP recommends that applicants include résumés 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).

Intergovernmental Review: This funding opportunity (program) **is not** subject to [Executive Order 12372](#). (In completing the SF-424, applicants are to make the appropriate selection in response to question 19 to indicate 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 a standard 12-point font (Times New Roman) 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.

Permission to Share Project Abstract with the Public: It is unlikely that NIJ will be able to fund all applications submitted under this solicitation, but it may have the opportunity to share information with the public regarding unfunded applications, for example, through a listing on a web page available to the public. The intent of this public posting would be to allow other possible funders to become aware of such proposals.

In the project abstract template, applicants are asked to indicate whether they give OJP permission to share their project abstract (including contact information) with the public if NIJ does not fund the proposed project. Granting (or failing to grant) this permission will not affect OJP's funding decisions, and, if the application is not funded, granting permission will not guarantee that project abstract information will be shared, nor will it guarantee funding from any other source.

Note: OJP may choose not to list a project that otherwise would have been included in a listing of unfunded applications, should the abstract fail to meet the format and content requirements noted above and outlined in the project abstract template.

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.¹⁷

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 email address) for both the applicant organization and the principal investigator.

¹⁷ 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.

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

If an applicant is resubmitting a proposal 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 proposal, and (2) a brief summary of revisions to the proposal, 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.
- 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 practitioners or policymakers – summary information from the planned scholarly products of the proposed project

(such as summaries 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. Performance Measures

To demonstrate program progress and success, as well as, to assist the Department 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, applicants that receive funding under this solicitation must provide data that measure the results of their work done under this solicitation. OJP will require any award recipient, post award, to provide the data requested in the “Data Grantee Provides” column so that OJP can calculate values for the “Performance Measures” column. (Submission of performance measures data is not required for the application.) Performance measures for this solicitation are as follows:

Objective	Performance Measure(s)	Data Grantee Provides
<p>Conduct research in social and behavioral sciences having clear implications for criminal justice policy and practice in the United States.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Relevance to the needs of the field as measured by whether the project’s substantive scope did not deviate from the funded proposal 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 (published, peer-reviewed, scientific journal articles, and/or (as appropriate for the funded project) law review journal articles, book chapter(s) or book(s) in the academic press, technological prototypes, patented inventions, or similar scientific products). 3. Quality of management as measured by such factors as whether significant project milestones were achieved, reporting and other deadlines were met, and costs remained within approved limits. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quarterly financial reports, semi-annual and final progress reports, and, if applicable, an annual audit report in accordance with the Part 200 Uniform Requirements of the work performed under the NIJ award. 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.

f. 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 proposal (including, for example, individuals such as statisticians serving as consultants to conduct proposed data analysis).
- List (to the extent known) of all proposed project staff members, including those affiliated with the applicant organization or any proposed subrecipient organization(s), any proposed consultant(s) and contractors (whether individuals or organizations), and any proposed members of an advisory board for the project (if applicable). The list should include, for each individual and organization: name, title (if applicable), employer or other organizational affiliation, and roles and responsibilities proposed for the project. 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 listing.
- 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 applicant organization 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 proposal has been submitted (if applicable).

- Data archiving plan. Applicants should anticipate that NIJ will require (through special award conditions, including 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 National Archive of Criminal Justice Data (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 project period.

4. Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative

a. Budget Detail Worksheet

A sample Budget Detail Worksheet can be found at www.ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/BudgetDetailWorksheet.pdf. Applicants that submit their budget in a different format should include the budget categories listed in the sample budget worksheet. (Work associated with satisfying data archiving requirements should be reflected.) NIJ expects applicants to provide a thorough narrative to each section of the Budget Detail Worksheet. The Budget Detail Worksheet should be broken down by year.

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

b. Budget Narrative

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

Applicants should demonstrate in their budget narratives how they will maximize cost effectiveness of grant 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 narrative should be sound mathematically, and correspond 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 they are relevant 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 be broken down 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. Non-Competitive Procurement Contracts In Excess of Simplified Acquisition Threshold

If an applicant proposes to make one or more non-competitive procurements of products or services, where the non-competitive procurement will exceed the simplified acquisition threshold (also known as the small purchase threshold), which is currently set at \$150,000, the application should address the considerations outlined in the [Financial Guide](#).

e. Pre-Agreement Cost Approvals

For information on pre-agreement costs approvals, see [Section B. Federal Award Information](#).

5. Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable)

Indirect costs are allowed only under the following circumstances:

- (a) The applicant has a current, federally approved indirect cost rate; or
- (b) The applicant 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).

Attach a copy of the federally approved indirect cost rate agreement to the application. Applicants that do not have an approved rate may request one through their cognizant

federal agency, which will review all documentation and approve a rate for the applicant organization, or, if the applicant's accounting system permits, costs may be allocated in the direct cost categories. For the definition of Cognizant Federal Agency, see the "Glossary of Terms" in the [Financial Guide](#). For assistance with identifying your cognizant agency, please contact the Customer Service Center at 1-800-458-0786 or at ask.ocfo@usdoj.gov. If DOJ is the cognizant federal agency, applicants may obtain information needed to submit an indirect cost rate proposal at www.ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/IndirectCosts.pdf.

In order to use the "de minimis" indirect rate, attach written documentation to the application that advises OJP of both the applicant's eligibility (to use the "de minimis" rate) and its election. If the applicant elects the "de minimis" method, costs must be consistently charged as either indirect or direct costs, but may not be double charged or inconsistently charged as both. In addition, if this method is chosen then it must be used consistently for all federal awards until such time as you choose to negotiate a federally approved indirect cost rate.¹⁸

6. Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable)

Tribes, tribal organizations, or third parties proposing to provide direct services or assistance to residents on tribal lands should include in their applications a resolution, a letter, affidavit, or other documentation, as appropriate, that certifies that the applicant has the legal authority from the tribe(s) to implement the proposed project on tribal lands. In those instances when an organization or consortium of tribes applies for a grant 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 grant. 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. Applicant Disclosure of High-Risk Status

Applicants are to disclose whether they are currently designated high-risk by another federal grant making agency. This includes any status requiring additional oversight by the federal agency due to past programmatic or financial concerns. If an applicant is designated high-risk by another federal grant making agency, you must email the following information to OJPComplianceReporting@usdoj.gov at the time of application submission:

- The federal agency that currently designated the applicant as high-risk.
- Date the applicant was designated high risk.
- The high-risk point of contact name, phone number, and email address, from that federal agency.
- Reasons for the high-risk status.

OJP seeks this information to ensure appropriate federal oversight of any grant award. Disclosing this high risk information does not disqualify any organization from receiving an

¹⁸ See 2 C.F.R. § 200.414(f).

OJP award. However, additional grant oversight may be included, if necessary, in award documentation.

8. Additional Attachments

a. Applicant disclosure of pending applications¹⁹

Applicants are to disclose whether they have pending applications for federally funded grants or subgrants (including cooperative agreements) that include requests for funding to support the same project being proposed under this solicitation and will cover the identical cost items outlined in the budget narrative and worksheet in the application under this solicitation. The disclosure should include both direct applications for federal funding (e.g., applications to federal agencies) and indirect applications for such funding (e.g., applications to State agencies that will subaward 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.

Applicants that have pending applications as described above are 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 funding agency.

Federal or State Funding Agency	Solicitation Name/Project Name	Name/Phone/E-mail for Point of Contact at Funding Agency
DOJ/COPS	COPS Hiring Program	Jane Doe, 202/000-0000; jane.doe@usdoj.gov
HHS/ 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

Applicants should include the table as a separate attachment to their application. The file should be named “Disclosure of Pending Applications.”

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.

Applicants that do not have pending applications as described above are to include a statement to this effect in the separate attachment page (e.g., “[Applicant Name on SF-424] does not have pending applications submitted within the last 12 months for federally funded grants or subgrants (including cooperative agreements) that include requests for funding to support the same project being proposed under this solicitation and will cover the identical cost items outlined in the budget narrative and worksheet in the application under this solicitation.”).

b. Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity

If a proposal involves research and/or evaluation, regardless of the proposal’s other merits, in order to receive funds, the applicant must demonstrate research/evaluation independence, including appropriate safeguards to ensure research/evaluation objectivity and integrity, both in this proposal and as it may relate to the applicant’s other current or prior related projects. This documentation may be included as an attachment to the application which addresses BOTH i. and ii. below.

- i. For purposes of this solicitation, applicants must document research and evaluation independence and integrity by including, at a minimum, one of the following two items:
 - a. A specific assurance that the applicant has reviewed its proposal to identify any research integrity issues (including all principal investigators and sub-recipients) and it has concluded that the design, conduct, or reporting of research and evaluation funded by NIJ grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts will not be biased by any personal or financial conflict of interest on the part of part of its staff, consultants, and/or sub-recipients responsible for the research and evaluation or on the part of the applicant organization;

OR

- b. A specific listing of actual or perceived conflicts of interest that the applicant has identified in relation to this proposal. These conflicts could be either personal (related to specific staff, consultants, and/or sub-recipients) or organizational (related to the applicant or any subgrantee organization). Examples of potential investigator (or other personal) conflict situations may include, but are not limited to, 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 could not be given a grant 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), as the organization in such an instance would 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 applicants must address the issue of 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 potential personal or organizational conflicts of interest exist, then the applicant should provide a brief narrative explanation of how and why it reached that conclusion. Applicants **MUST** also include an explanation of the specific processes and procedures that the applicant will put in place to identify and eliminate (or, at the very least, mitigate) potential personal or financial conflicts of interest on the part of its staff, consultants, and/or sub-recipients for this particular project, should that be necessary during the grant period. Documentation that may be helpful in this regard could include organizational codes of ethics/conduct or policies regarding organizational, personal, and financial conflicts of interest.

OR

- b. If the applicant has identified specific personal or organizational conflicts of interest in its proposal during this review, the applicant must propose a specific and robust mitigation plan to address conflicts noted above. At a minimum, the plan must include specific processes and procedures that the applicant will put in place to eliminate (or, at the very least, mitigate) potential personal or financial conflicts of interest on the part of its staff, consultants, and/or sub-recipients for this particular project, should that be necessary during the grant period. Documentation that may be helpful in this regard could include organizational codes of ethics/conduct or policies regarding organizational, personal, and financial conflicts of interest. There is no guarantee that the plan, if any, will be accepted as proposed.

Considerations in assessing research and evaluation independence and integrity will include, but are not be limited to, the adequacy of the applicant's efforts to identify factors that could affect the objectivity or integrity of the proposed staff and/or the organization 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.

9. Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire

In accordance with the Part 200 Uniform Requirements as set out at [2 C.F.R. 200.205](#), federal agencies must have in place a framework for evaluating the risks posed by applicants before they receive a federal award. To facilitate part of this risk evaluation, **all** applicants (other than an individual) are to download, complete, and submit this [form](#).

10. Disclosure of Lobbying Activities

All applicants must complete this information. Applicants that expend any funds for lobbying activities are to provide the detailed information requested on the form [Disclosure of Lobbying Activities \(SF-LLL\)](#). Applicants that do not expend any funds for lobbying activities are to enter "N/A" in the text boxes for item 10 ("a. Name and Address of Lobbying Registrant" and "b. Individuals Performing Services").

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**, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, except 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 and a user password. OJP encourages applicants to **register several weeks before** the application submission deadline. In addition, OJP urges applicants to submit applications 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.

NIJ 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.

Note on Attachments. Grants.gov has two categories of files for attachments: mandatory and optional. OJP receives all files attached in both categories. Please insure all required documents are attached in the mandatory category.

Note on File Names and File Types: Grants.gov only permits the use of certain specific characters in names of attachment files. Valid file names may include only the characters shown in the table below. Grants.gov is designed to reject any application that includes an attachment(s) with a file name that contains any characters not shown in the table below. Grants.gov is designed to forward successfully submitted applications to OJP's 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 “&#amp;” 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:

OJP may not make a federal award to an applicant organization until the applicant organization has complied with all applicable DUNS and SAM requirements. Individual applicants must comply with all Grants.gov requirements. If an applicant has not fully complied with the requirements by the time the federal awarding agency is ready to make a federal award, the

federal awarding agency may determine that the applicant is not qualified to receive a federal award and use that determination as a basis for making a federal award to another applicant.

Individual applicants should search Grants.gov for a funding opportunity for which individuals are eligible to apply. Use the Funding Opportunity Number (FON) to register. Complete the registration form at <https://apply07.grants.gov/apply/IndCPRegister> to create a username and password. Individual applicants should complete all steps except 1, 2 and 4.

- 1. Acquire a Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number.** In general, the Office of Management and Budget requires that all applicants (other than individuals) for federal funds include a DUNS number in their applications for a new award or a supplement to an existing award. A DUNS number is a unique nine-digit sequence recognized as the universal standard for identifying and differentiating entities receiving federal funds. The identifier is used for tracking purposes and to validate address and point of contact information for federal assistance applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. The DUNS number will be used throughout the grant life cycle. 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 standard information about federal financial assistance applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. OJP requires all applicants (other than individuals) for federal financial assistance to maintain current registrations in the SAM database. Applicants must be registered in SAM to successfully register in Grants.gov. Applicants must **update or renew their SAM registration annually** to maintain an active status. SAM registration and renewal can take as long as 10 business days to complete.

Applications 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 up to 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. The applicant organization's DUNS number must be used to complete this step. For more information about the registration process, go to www.grants.gov/web/grants/register.html. Individuals registering with Grants.gov should go to <https://apply07.grants.gov/apply/IndCPRegister>.
- 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 number for this solicitation is 16.560 titled "National Institute of

Justice Research, Evaluation, and Development Project Grants” and the funding opportunity numbers are:

- Category 1: NIJ-2016-9395.
- Category 2: NIJ-2016-9396.
- Category 3: NIJ-2016-9397.
- Category 4: NIJ-2016-9398.

- 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.
- 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 and the second will state whether the application has been successfully validated, or 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 well ahead of the deadline provides time to correct the problem(s) that caused the rejection. **Important:** OJP urges applicants to submit applications **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. All applications are due to be submitted and in receipt of a successful validation message in Grants.gov by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on May 17, 2016.

Click [here](#) for further details on DUNS, SAM, and Grants.gov registration steps and timeframes.

Note: Duplicate Applications

If an applicant submits multiple versions of the same application, NIJ will review only the most recent system-validated version submitted. See Note on File Names and File Types under [How To Apply](#).

Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues

Applicants that experience unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond their control that prevent them from submitting their 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. Then the applicant must e-mail the NIJ contact identified in the Contact Information section on page 2 **within 24 hours after the application deadline** and request approval to submit their application. The e-mail must describe the technical difficulties, and 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: NIJ does not automatically approve requests.** After the program office

reviews the submission, and contacts the Grants.gov or SAM Help Desks to validate 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 applicant failed to follow all required procedures, which resulted in an untimely application submission, OJP will deny the applicant's request to submit their application.

The following conditions are generally 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, including firewalls.

Notifications regarding known technical problems with Grants.gov, if any, are posted at the top of the OJP funding web page at <http://ojp.gov/funding/index.htm>.

E. Application Review Information

Selection 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 – 20%

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

1. Potential for significantly improved understanding of the stated criminal/juvenile justice problem.
2. 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 proposal).
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.

Budget

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. Proposed budget alignment with proposed project activities.

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

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

Review Process

OJP is committed to ensuring a fair and open process for awarding grants. 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 applicants have met basic minimum requirements, OJP screens applications for compliance with specified program requirements to help determine which applications should proceed to further consideration for award. Although

program requirements may vary, the following are common requirements applicable to all solicitations for funding under OJP grant programs:

- Applications must be submitted by an eligible type of applicant.
- Applications must request funding within programmatic funding constraints (if applicable).
- Applications must be responsive to the scope of the solicitation.
- Applications must include all items designated as “critical elements.”
- Applicants will be checked against the System for Award Management.

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

NIJ may use internal peer reviewers, external peer reviewers, or a combination, to assess applications meeting basic minimum requirements on technical merit using the solicitation’s selection 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. A peer review panel will evaluate, score, and rate applications that meet basic minimum requirements.

OJP reviews applications for potential discretionary awards to evaluate the risks posed by applicants before they receive an award. This review may include but is not limited to the following:

1. Financial stability and fiscal integrity.
2. Quality of management systems and ability to meet the management standards prescribed in the Financial Guide.
3. History of performance.
4. Reports and findings from audits.
5. The applicant's ability to effectively implement statutory, regulatory, or other requirements imposed on award recipients.
6. Proposed costs to determine if the Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative accurately explain project costs, and whether those costs are reasonable, necessary, and allowable under applicable federal cost principles and agency regulations.

All final award decisions will be made by the Director of the National Institute of Justice. Peer reviewers’ ratings and any resulting recommendations are advisory only, although their views are considered carefully. In addition to peer review ratings, considerations for award recommendations and decisions may include, but are not limited to, planned scholarly products, proposed budgets, past performance (including scholarly products) under prior NIJ and OJP

awards, research independence and integrity, strategic priorities, and available funding when making awards.

F. Federal Award Administration Information

Federal Award Notices

OJP sends award notification 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 how to accept the award in GMS. GMS automatically issues the notifications at 9:00 p.m. eastern time on the award date (by September 30, 2016). Recipients will be required to login; accept any outstanding assurances and certifications on the award; designate a financial point of contact; and review, sign, and accept the award. The award acceptance process involves 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 agency-approved project proposal and budget, the recipient must comply with award terms and conditions, and other legal requirements, that are included in the award, incorporated into the award by reference, or are otherwise applicable to the award. OJP strongly encourages prospective applicants to review the information pertaining to these requirements **prior** to submitting an application. To assist applicants and recipients in accessing and reviewing this information, OJP has placed it on its [Solicitation Requirements](#) page of the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#).

Please note in particular the following two forms, which applicants must submit in GMS prior to the receipt of any award funds, as each details legal requirements with which applicants must provide specific assurances and certifications of compliance. Applicants may view these forms in the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#) and are strongly encouraged to review and consider them carefully prior to making an application for OJP grant funds.

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

Upon grant approval, OJP electronically transmits (via GMS) the award document to the prospective award recipient. In addition to other award information, the award document contains award terms and conditions that specify national policy requirements²⁰ with which recipients of federal funding must comply; uniform administrative requirements, cost principles, and audit requirements; and program-specific terms and conditions required based on applicable program (statutory) authority or requirements set forth in OJP solicitations and program announcements. For example, certain efforts may call for special requirements, terms, or conditions relating to intellectual property, data/information-sharing or -access, or information

²⁰ See *generally* 2 C.F.R. 200.300 (provides a general description of national policy requirements typically applicable to recipients of federal awards, including the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (FFATA)).

security; or audit requirements, expenditures and milestones, or publications and/or press releases.

OJP also may place additional terms and conditions on an award based on its risk assessment of the applicant, or for other reasons it determines necessary to fulfill the goals and objectives of the program.

Prospective applicants may access and review the text of mandatory conditions OJP includes in all OJP awards, as well as the text of certain other conditions, such as administrative conditions, via the [Mandatory Award Terms and Conditions](#) page of the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#).

As stated above, NIJ may elect to make awards under this program as either a grant or a cooperative agreement. Cooperative agreement awards include standard “federal involvement” conditions that describe the general allocation of responsibility for execution of the funded program. Generally stated, under cooperative agreement awards, responsibility for the day-to-day conduct of the funded project rests with the recipient in implementing the funded and approved proposal and budget, and the award terms and conditions. Responsibility for oversight and redirection of the project, if necessary, rests with NIJ.

In addition to any “federal involvement” condition(s), OJP cooperative agreement awards include a special condition specifying certain reporting requirements required in connection with conferences, meetings, retreats, seminars, symposium, training activities, or similar events funded under the award, consistent with OJP policy and guidance on “conference” approval, planning, and reporting.

General Information About Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements

Recipients 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. Applicants should anticipate that NIJ will require recipients to use a version of the non-budgetary components of the Research Performance Progress Report (RPPR) template/format for progress reports, appropriately modified for NIJ research awards. 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.

Special Reporting requirements may be required by OJP depending on the statutory, legislative or administrative requirements of the recipient or the program.

As indicated earlier in this solicitation, NIJ expects scholarly products to result from any award under this solicitation. Please review the [Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products](#) segment of the “Program-Specific Information” section of this solicitation, as well as the “Performance Measures” section.

In addition to the expectation of scholarly products, successful applicants under this solicitation will be required to submit the following deliverables regarding the work funded by the NIJ award.

Required Data Sets and Associated Files and Documentation

As discussed earlier, NIJ requires recipients of an award under this solicitation to submit to NACJD all data sets that result in whole or in part from the work funded by NIJ, along with associated files and any 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. All data sets and necessary documentation are to be submitted 90 days prior to the end of the project period. For more information, see the "Program Narrative" section of [What an Application Should Include](#).

G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)

For Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s), see the title page.

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

H. Other Information

Provide Feedback to OJP

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

IMPORTANT: This e-mail is for feedback and suggestions only. Replies are not sent from this mailbox. If you have specific questions on any program or technical aspect of the solicitation, you must directly contact the appropriate number or e-mail listed on the front of this solicitation document. These contacts are provided to help ensure that you can directly reach an individual who can address your specific questions in a timely manner.

If you are interested in being a reviewer for other OJP grant applications, please e-mail your résumé to ojppeerreview@lmsolas.com. The OJP Solicitation Feedback email account will not forward your résumé. **Note:** Neither you nor anyone else from your organization can be a peer reviewer in a competition in which you or your organization have submitted an application.

Application Checklist

Research and Evaluation in Support of the Recommendations of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing

This application checklist has been created to assist in developing an application.

What an Applicant Should Do:

Prior to Registering in Grants.gov:

- _____ Acquire a DUNS Number (see page 29)
- _____ Acquire or renew registration with SAM (see page 29)

To Register with Grants.gov:

- _____ Acquire AOR and Grants.gov username/password (see page 29)
- _____ Acquire AOR confirmation from the E-Biz POC (see page 29)

To Find Funding Opportunity:

- _____ Search for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov (see page 29)
- _____ Select the correct Competition ID (see page 30)
- _____ Download Funding Opportunity and Application Package
- _____ Sign up for Grants.gov [email](#) notifications (optional) (see page 28)
- _____ Read [Important Notice: Applying for Grants in Grants.gov](#)
- _____ Read OJP policy and guidance on “conference” approval, planning, and reporting available at [ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/PostawardRequirements/chapter3.10a.htm](#) (see page 16)

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

- _____ (1) application has been received
- _____ (2) application has either been successfully validated or rejected with errors (see page 30)

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

- _____ Please refer to the section: Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues (see page 30)

General Requirements:

- _____ Review the [Solicitation Requirements](#) in the OJP Funding Resource Center.

What an Application Should Include:

- _____ Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) (see page 17)
- _____ Project Abstract (if applicable) (see page 17)
- _____ Program Narrative (see page 18)
- _____ Budget Detail Worksheet (see page 22)
- _____ Budget Narrative (see page 22)
- _____ Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable) (see page 23)
- _____ Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable) (see page 24)
- _____ Applicant Disclosure of High-Risk Status (see page 24)
- _____ Additional Attachments
 - _____ Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications (see page 25)
 - _____ Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity (see page 26)
- _____ Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire

(see page 27)

_____ [Disclosure of Lobbying Activities \(SF-LLL\)](#) (see page 27)

_____ Employee Compensation Waiver request and justification (if applicable)
(see page 15)