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

**FY 2018 Comprehensive School Safety Initiative**

**Applications Due: May 7, 2018**

**Eligibility**

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

Foreign governments, foreign organizations, and foreign colleges and universities are not eligible to apply.

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

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

---

1 For additional information on subawards, see "Budget and Associated Documentation" under Section D. Application and Submission Information.
Under this solicitation, any particular applicant entity may submit more than one application, as long as each application proposes a different project in response to the solicitation. Also, an entity may be proposed as a subrecipient (subgrantee) in more than one application.

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

**Deadline**

Applicants must register with Grants.gov at [https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/register.html](https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/register.html) prior to submitting an application. All applications are due by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on May 7, 2018.

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

OJP encourages all applicants to read this [Important Notice: Applying for Grants in Grants.gov](https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/register.html).

For additional information, see [How to Apply in Section D. Application and Submission Information](https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/register.html).

**Contact Information**

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

An applicant that experiences unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond its control that prevent it from submitting its application by the deadline may email the NIJ contact identified below within **24 hours after the application deadline** to request approval to submit its application. Additional information on reporting technical issues appears under Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues in the [How to Apply](https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/register.html) 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](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](http://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](http://www.nij.gov/funding/Pages/faqs.aspx).

Grants.gov number assigned to this solicitation: NIJ-2018-14140

Release date: February 22, 2018
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A. Program Description

Overview

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

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

Program-Specific Information

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

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

Framing the Problems that CSSI Aims to Address

CSSI funding may support and address a wide range of school safety activities. Within the program parameters and in furtherance of the goals and objectives detailed in this solicitation, applicants have considerable discretion in determining the kinds of school safety initiatives they propose to address. Applicants are strongly advised to review previously funded projects. Although proposals to fund similar studies as those funded in FYs 14-17 will be considered for

---

CSSI funding in FY18, NIJ will give priority in award decisions to those studies and projects that advance school safety research in new and novel ways.

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

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

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

---

4 COPS and Department of Education SECURe Rubrics can be found here: [http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/supportingsafeschools](http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/supportingsafeschools).
7 All five volumes available for download here [https://school safetyinfo.org/](https://school safetyinfo.org/).
As noted on the title page, NIJ strongly recommends that research organizations be designated as the applicant (the “prime”) for CSSI awards, making subawards (“subgrants”) to participating stakeholders, as appropriate for the proposed project. This arrangement is preferred in order to produce the highest quality research while reducing administrative burdens to SEAs, LEAs, and other stakeholders. Research organizations may be institutions of higher education, nonprofit or for-profit organizations, or public entities that have experience in conducting applied research and evaluation.

An applicant may propose to work with any combination of elementary, middle, or high schools, or may elect to focus solely on a single type of school or range of grades. An applicant should consider carefully the schools and grades that it will focus on, based on the research questions it proposes to address. NIJ is particularly interested in research involving charter schools and alternative schools. Alternative schools and/or alternative programs are designed to address the needs of students that typically cannot be met in a regular school. The students who attend alternative schools and programs are typically at risk of educational failure (as indicated by poor grades, truancy, disruptive behavior, pregnancy, or other factors associated with temporary or permanent withdrawal from school). Care should be taken to assure that proposed programmatic and research activities are developmentally appropriate for the impacted student population. Applicants are also encouraged to consider appropriate ways to involve students and parents in safety planning and activities.

Applicants should consider interventions that include coordination with diverse partners, including local law enforcement, behavioral and mental health professionals, courts, criminal and juvenile justice professionals, as well as parents and youth. Proposed interventions should take into account recent research findings related to disciplinary policies and practices that may be overly harsh or exclusionary.

**Areas of Interest for School Safety Research**

NIJ is particularly interested in applications that address:

**School Shootings**

Schools and communities have developed a number of programs, practices, and policies for the purpose of preventing and responding to incidents of lethal violence in school settings. For example, most schools have developed emergency operations plans to prepare for what to do in the case of an active shooter event. Also, some schools have implemented threat assessment protocols, crisis response teams, and anonymous tip lines to facilitate early detection and prevention of potentially violent situations. NIJ is interested in supporting projects likely to provide credible and objective knowledge that schools may use to more effectively prevent and respond to school shootings and other incidents involving mass violence.

**School Resource Officers**

NIJ continues to be interested in research to inform the work of school resource officers, other law enforcement, and security officers (hereafter referred to as SROs) who work within/coordinate with schools. The existing body of research on SRO programs is limited,

---

both by the number of studies and by the rigor of the studies that have been conducted. Available research draws conflicting conclusions about whether SRO programs reduce school violence. Current CSSI studies examine SRO selection and training, SROs involvement in school discipline, the impact of SROs on student and teacher perceptions of school climate and safety as well as examinations of the costs associated with implementing SRO programs. NIJ seeks additional research on unexamined topics related to SROs.

School Discipline and School Coordination with the Criminal Justice System

Developing a positive school climate and refining school discipline policies and practices are critical steps to improving student safety and success. The growing body of research on school discipline should inform locally developed approaches to identifying factors that may lead to poor school climate. NIJ encourages applicants to develop and evaluate programs and practices that involve stakeholders — school districts, courts, law enforcement (including police, sheriff’s departments, and district attorneys’ offices), public defenders, family and child welfare system personnel, and communities (e.g., parents, students, local leaders) — working together to address issues related to school safety and violence. Relatedly, NIJ encourages applicants to develop school-based policies and practices that: (1) hold students accountable for misbehavior using graduated sanctions appropriate to the behavior; (2) minimize the use of forms of discipline that remove or exclude a student from his or her educational setting and school-based arrests; and (3) provide opportunities for students to learn from their mistakes. NIJ is also interested in expanding the body of knowledge concerning observed disparities in school discipline based on demographics. More rigorous research is needed to identify the sources of those disparities (e.g., prior and current student behavior, implicit bias on the part of those administering the discipline, and others).

Disinvestment in Ineffective School Safety Programs

Withdrawing resources or ceasing the use of a particular program, policy, or practice has been termed “disinvestment” and has been recommended in instances where there is little perceived benefit relative to the costs expended in implementing a program. In education, there is a strong push to promote the use of evidence-based programs/policies/practices (EBPs) and many schools use EBPs to address school safety issues. However, years of evaluation research have demonstrated that not all programs/policies/practices are effective. They may be generally ineffective or ineffective in certain conditions and/or with specific populations. Relatedly, programs may be ineffective at reaching desired outcomes, but effective at accomplishing other desirable, yet unintended outcomes. However, these ineffective programs/policies/practices are often used in schools at the same time as EBPs.

NIJ is interested in the examination of several questions related to disinvestment in ineffective programs/policies/practices related to the safety of schools and students. Disinvestment research is a new area of investigation for the field. Since this area of research is in its burgeoning stages, NIJ envisions that this research would be exploratory and would possibly take a case study approach. Examples of disinvestment-related questions that may be examined include:

• What barriers to success exist when trying to implement evidence-based programs/practices in school safety?

• As a school incorporates EBPs to improve school safety, how does the use of programs and practices with no demonstrated effects, harmful effects, or limited benefits impact the use and/or outcomes of EBPs?

• What challenges occur when school systems try to disinvest in particular programs/practices/policies?

**Bullying and Cyberbullying Intervention and Prevention**

Bullying continues to be a serious problem in America’s schools. In 2015, about 21 percent of students, ages 12-18 reported being bullied at school during the previous academic school year. In the past few decades, research has improved the fields’ understanding of what bullying behavior is, how to measure it, and the types of school climates that foster conditions that are ripe for bullying. Technology and social media now allow for a type of digitally aggressive behavior, cyberbullying. NIJ would like to continue examinations of bullying and cyberbullying with a focus on multicomponent, school-wide programs aimed at reducing bullying and improving school safety. NIJ is particularly interested in studying the implementation of these prevention programs and learning lessons from successfully implemented prevention and intervention programs. Applicants are encouraged to refer to the National Academy of Sciences’ *Preventing Bullying Through Science, Policy, and Practice* to propose research that will advance the field of bullying prevention and intervention research.

**School Safety in Non-Classroom Settings**

In a school, there are non-classroom settings where students are at increased risk for victimization. Areas such as cafeterias, hallways, playgrounds, bathrooms, bus loading zones, buses, parking lots, assemblies, sporting events, dances, and others are locations where school administrators have reported increased incidents of school violence and bullying. These are also areas where students may outnumber school staff, and instruction is not readily available as a behavioral management tool. NIJ is interested in empirical research on how active supervision techniques in non-classroom school settings and student management techniques affect levels of school violence. This would include walking to and from school, as well as the bus ride to and from school.

**Implementation and Translation of School Safety Research**

The program evaluation literature has highlighted the importance of high-quality program implementation. Techniques have been developed that can support the design and testing of programs and the improvement of school safety programs. However, research occurs in the context of local schools, and school districts, with different policies and procedures. That local context has implications for successful implementation. More research is needed to

---


answer questions such as: does replication of rigorously implemented programs yield similar results as previous studies; what are the most effective components in the design of a school safety intervention; how can we test variations in implementation of school safety programs; and can altering the intensity of a program affect school safety outcomes? NIJ is soliciting research to support innovative approaches to identifying, understanding, and overcoming barriers to the adoption, replication, adaptation, integration, scale-up, and sustainability of evidence-based interventions, practices, policies, and guidelines in school safety research. Relevant projects should contribute to the knowledge base about “how” interventions are transported to real-world practice settings.

**CSSI Funding Categories**

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

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

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

This solicitation will also include funding categories to support short-term research on causes and consequences of school safety issues, as well as the dissemination of research from CSSI.

- **Category 4:** Research on School Safety.
- **Category 5:** Translation and Dissemination of Comprehensive School Safety Initiative Findings.

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

Applicants for Categories 1-3 should:

- Dedicate up to 1/3 (one-third) of funding directly to research partners to develop and carry out a rigorous program of evaluation. No less than 2/3 (two-thirds) of funding

---

12 The Youth.gov website provides summary information and links to federal programs that use a tiered evidence framework, including the Department of Education’s Investing in Innovation Fund (i3) [https://youth.gov/evidence-innovation/investing-evidence/investing-innovation-fund](https://youth.gov/evidence-innovation/investing-evidence/investing-innovation-fund).
should go towards the personnel, programs, equipment, materials, training, and other activities intended to advance school and student safety that will be subject to evaluation. A budget should be prepared for the full period of performance that clearly reflects the 1/3 and 2/3 split. See below in What an Application Should Include for more details on expectations and requirements.

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

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

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

- Submit, along with the application, an administrative agreement or, at a minimum, a letter of support from all project partners. At a minimum, this is to include LEAs or SEAs and research partners, but it may also include behavioral and mental health service providers, law enforcement, courts, municipal government partners, and others, as appropriate. If an award is made, recipients should submit a fully executed, written agreement between the relevant LEAs or SEAs and the research partner. This agreement should provide details on the roles and responsibilities of each party and on what will be done to ensure that the independence and objectivity of the research is maintained.13

Applicants to this funding opportunity should not propose projects for which the primary purpose is to demonstrate and evaluate existing technologies, or develop, demonstrate, and evaluate school safety related technologies.

---

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

**Competition ID: NIJ-2018-14141**

This category of the solicitation is aimed at providing LEAs, SEAs, and school research scholars with an opportunity to develop new, innovative, and evidence-based programs, practices, or strategies that have not yet undergone evaluation. NIJ has a strong interest in developing new programs that have the potential to improve school safety and reduce the potential harms associated with addressing school safety issues.

13 An applicant, if funded, also must ensure, among other things that any subaward has appropriate authorization, is clearly identified to the subrecipient, and includes all required information consistent with the Part 200 Uniform Requirements. See, e.g., 2 CFR 200.331. The "Part 200 Uniform Requirements" means the DOJ regulation at 2 C.F.R Part 2800, which adopts (with certain modifications) the provisions of 2 C.F.R. Part 200.
Applicants are encouraged to propose early-stage or exploratory research and evaluation projects to build evidence for novel and innovative school safety interventions. The novel grants will support the development of interventions and pilot tests of the implementation of the developed interventions. This research may help to identify factors that are likely to mediate or moderate relationships between school safety activities and intended outcomes in particular settings or with particular populations. For example, applicants may consider developing school safety programs for different types of schools, like alternative schools and charter schools, or for different non-classroom-based settings. This is also an opportunity for LEAs to formally evaluate programs that have been locally developed. NIJ considers innovation grants as short-term, small-scale projects that may set the stage for more extensive or rigorous projects to follow; they may provide evidence for whether an intervention or strategy is ready to be subjected to a more rigorous efficacy or effectiveness evaluation. Under this funding category, NIJ will not consider proposals for programs or practices that have undergone any previous evaluations.

---

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

Competition ID: NIJ-2018-14142

The purpose of Category 2 is to support demonstrations and evaluations of programs, practices, policies, and strategies designed to enhance school and student safety. There continues to be a need for research using strong research designs, such as randomized controlled trials. NIJ also sees a need for funding replications of evidence-based programs in different settings in order to confirm previous findings. In keeping with the focus on funding research based on a continuum of evidence, this category will solicit applications for funding for rigorous evaluations of interventions (including RCTs) that have already undergone some evaluation and have demonstrated promise for enhancing school and student safety.

Applicants are asked to conduct independent evaluations of promising programs. They are also asked to develop the most robust research designs possible that will produce scientific evidence regarding the efficacy, effectiveness, and cost/benefit of these programs. One example of a project that may be considered under this category is an evaluation of an intervention by an outside researcher when the program/model developer has evidence of positive outcomes via internal evaluations. Applicants may propose studies that test individual programs, practices, and strategies; or that test a combination of multiple approaches that have been previously evaluated. Applicants should consider including cost/benefit analysis. In cases where evaluations find that interventions have produced the intended benefit, cost/benefit analysis provides valuable and practical information for practitioners and policymakers that aids decision-making. There is no requirement to study programs from a specified list; however, applicants are strongly encouraged to examine NIJ’s CrimeSolutions.gov, the Institute of Education Sciences What Works Clearinghouse, and various other “what works” repositories to identify promising programs and practices that may be ready for additional evaluation and validation. If an applicant chooses to implement a program that has been designated “No Effects” on CrimeSolutions.gov, the applicant should provide a strong justification for the choice of program in their application.

Randomized controlled trial (RCT) studies are a powerful, much needed tool for building scientific evidence about what works. Therefore, studies employing RCT methods to assess the

---

14 In general, NIJ prefers that program developers engage with independent research entities to evaluate the programs that they develop.
effectiveness of programs and practices will be given higher priority consideration in award decisions. RCT applications with strong designs measuring outcomes of self-evident policy importance are strongly encouraged. A strong RCT design should include low sample attrition, sufficient sample size, close adherence to random assignment, valid outcome measures, and statistical analyses. Taking RCT costs into consideration, applicants may want to consider studies using privacy-protected administrative data that are already being collected or implementing an intervention into a program already funded.

Category 3: Expanding the Use of Effective Interventions Through Scaling-Up

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

Applicants should describe the intervention that will be scaled-up, and provide the research evidence to demonstrate that the intervention is ready to go to scale. Key project participants (e.g., LEAs, SEAs) should provide letters of support indicating their willingness to participate in the implementation and the research associated with the project. Applicants may request resources to facilitate the project, including entering into an agreement with the program developer or training organization. The program narrative should also include a sound implementation strategy, and a rigorous evaluation of that strategy. This plan should provide a realistic foundation for implementation, based on the implementation science literature, and be flexible enough for the necessary adjustments that have to be made as scaling-up proceeds.

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

Second, scaling-up must be concerned with sustainable policy and program development, including attention to institutionalizing the intervention in policies, program guidelines, budgets, and other dimensions of the school system. In this regard, applicants are encouraged to include cost/benefit analysis in the proposal. Cost/benefit analysis is an effective way to communicate and disseminate findings from evaluation research and aids in decision-making.
Finally, these projects must assess scalability. Scalability refers to the ease or difficulty of scaling up the intervention, based on attributes of success, which have previously been identified in research on implementation science and through practical experience. Applicants should consider carefully these important principles as they design the scale-up project.

---

**Category 4: Research on School Safety**

**Competition ID: NIJ-2018-14144**

The purpose of Category 4 is to produce research findings with implications for school safety practice and policy. In this category, NIJ is particularly interested in research that investigates common, but understudied practices and strategies related to school safety. Although project periods for this funding category may be for as long as three years, NIJ also encourages applicants for Category 4 studies to propose short-term studies with project periods that are two years or less.

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

---

**Category 5: Translation and Dissemination of Comprehensive School Safety Initiative Findings**

**Competition ID: NIJ-2018-14145**

One of NIJ’s strategic goals is to translate knowledge to practice by disseminating rigorous scientific research to practitioners to advance what works best in preventing crime and violence. The CSSI initiative is focused on generating rigorous scientific research on school safety and translating that research into practice, in schools and communities across the nation, in ways that are measurable and improve school safety. To date, NIJ has funded almost 100 projects under CSSI. As the results of these studies begin to accumulate and circulate, NIJ is interested in funding multiple entities to undertake far-reaching and broad translation and dissemination activities, in coordination with NIJ.

The findings from CSSI research have implications for SEAs, LEAs, school administrators, principals, teachers, school staff, parents, students, researchers, policymakers, law enforcement officials, and mental and behavioral health school practitioners. Applicants should
demonstrate an ability to engage directly with various audiences, in many ways. Proposals should include strategies for a broad range of dissemination activities including, but not limited to:

- Developing both written and video products synthesizing research results into easily digestible pieces.
- Translating research results into practical lessons and policies that can be implemented by educators.
- Creating campaigns using supplementary educational materials such as posters, infographics, magazine articles, etc. to reach targeted populations of principals, teachers, parents, and students with evidence-based school safety messages.
- Hosting training and technical assistance webinars on school safety topics.
- Working with NIJ to plan and host our 2020 NIJ School Safety Conference, which will gather between 300-500 of our grantees, their practitioner partners, federal staff, and school safety stakeholders from across the country in Washington, DC, for a two-day research conference.
- Engaging in social media campaigns around school safety messages, which may include creating content for magazines, websites, blogs, and engaging with leading education social media outlets, where important school safety stakeholders obtain information.

In these proposals, applicants should anticipate up to three years of funding for this work. Clear strategies for coordination with NIJ should be outlined. Applicants should also propose strategies to assess the impact of these dissemination efforts.

**New Investigator/Early Career Opportunity**

NIJ is interested in supporting researchers who are early in their careers and new to NIJ's research grant portfolios, specifically non-tenured assistant professors, or equivalent full-time staff scientist positions in a research institution, who propose research on topics relevant to NIJ’s Office of Research and Evaluation (ORE) and/or Office of Science and Technology (OST). Applications that include a principal investigator (PI) who meets the criteria may, in appropriate circumstances, be given special consideration in award decisions.

At the time of application submission, the proposed PI must:

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

Note that NIJ grant awards are made to the applicant institution and do not transfer with the proposed PI to other institutions; the institution that applies for the award should be the institution that will manage the award for the duration of the project period. The applicant should identify that this is a New Investigator/Early Career proposal on the title page of its application.

**Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products**

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

- Increasing scientific knowledge about the root causes, characteristics, and consequences of school violence and other threats to school and student safety.
- Developing, supporting, and rigorously evaluating a wide range of school and student safety programs, practices, and strategies.
- Developing a comprehensive school safety framework based on the best available information and evidence and testing it in selected school districts.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Performance Measure(s)</th>
<th>Data Recipient Provides</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Conduct research in social and behavioral sciences having clear implications for criminal justice policy and practice in the United States. | 1. Relevance to the needs of the field as measured by whether the project’s substantive scope did not deviate from the funded project or any subsequent agency-approved modifications to the scope.  
2. Quality of the research as demonstrated by the scholarly products that result in whole or in part from work funded under the NIJ award, such as published, peer-reviewed, scientific journal articles, and/or (as appropriate for the funded project) law review journal articles, book chapter(s) or book(s) in the academic press, technological prototypes, patented inventions, or similar scientific products.  
3. Quality of management as measured by such factors as whether significant project milestones were achieved, reporting and other deadlines were met, and costs remained within approved limits. | 1. Quarterly financial reports, semi-annual and final progress reports, and products of the work performed under the NIJ award (including, at minimum, a final research report).  
2. If applicable, an annual audit report.  
3. List of citation(s) to all scholarly products that resulted in whole or in part from work funded under the NIJ award.  
4. If applicable, each data set that resulted in whole or in part from work funded under the NIJ award. |

Evaluation Research

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

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

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

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

B. Federal Award Information

For Category 1: NIJ estimates that a total of $5 million will become available. NIJ anticipates awards will be made with performance periods ranging from 24-48 months. NIJ expects to make awards in this category in the form of grants.

For Category 2: NIJ estimates that a total of up to $11 million will become available. NIJ anticipates awards will be made with performance periods ranging from 24-48 months. NIJ expects to make awards in this category in the form of grants.

For Category 3: NIJ estimates that a total of up to $13 million will become available. NIJ anticipates awards will be made with performance periods ranging from 24-48 months. NIJ expects to make awards in this category in the form of grants.

For Category 4: NIJ estimates that a total of up to $7 million will become available. NIJ anticipates that it will make awards with performance periods ranging from 12-24 months. NIJ expects to make awards in this category in the form of grants.

For Category 5: NIJ estimates that a total of up to $3 million will become available. NIJ anticipates that it will make awards with performance periods ranging from 36-48 months. NIJ expects to make awards in this category in the form of cooperative agreements.

An applicant should base its federal funding request and period of performance on the actual requirements of the research, and not necessarily on the anticipated amount of funding available in FY 2018 for awards under this solicitation. However, to expedite the budget approval process, applicants are encouraged to break out their budgets by project year or by phases in the event that NIJ choses to fund the project partially or incrementally.
To allow time for (among other things) any necessary post-award review and financial clearance by OJP of the proposed budget and for any associated responses or other action(s) that may be required of the recipient, applicants should propose an award start date of January 1, 2019.

If the applicant is proposing a project that reasonably could be conducted in discrete phases, with each phase resulting in completion of one or more significant, defined milestones, then NIJ strongly recommends that the applicant structure the application—specifically including the narrative, expected scholarly products, timelines/milestones, and budget detail worksheet and budget narrative—to clearly define each phase. (This is particularly the case if the applicant proposes a project that will exceed—in cost or the length of the period of performance—the amount or length of time anticipated for an individual award (or awards) under this solicitation.) Given limitations on the availability to NIJ of funds for awards for research, development, and evaluation, this information will assist NIJ in considering whether partial funding of applications would be productive. (If, in 2018, NIJ elects to fund only certain phases of a proposed project, the expected scholarly products from the partial-funding award may, in some cases, vary from those described above.)

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

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

**Type of Award**

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

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

**Please note:** Any recipient of an award under this solicitation will be required to comply with DOJ regulations on confidentiality and protection of human subjects. See “Requirements related to Research” under “Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2017 Awards” in the OJP Funding Resource Center at https://ojp.gov/funding/index.htm.
Financial Management and System of Internal Controls

Award recipients and subrecipients (including recipients or subrecipients that are pass-through entities\footnote{For purposes of this solicitation, the phrase “pass-through entity” includes any recipient or subrecipient that provides a subaward (“subgrant”) to carry out part of the funded award or program.}) must, as described in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements\footnote{The “Part 200 Uniform Requirements” means the DOJ regulation at 2 C.F.R Part 2800, which adopts (with certain modifications) the provisions of 2 C.F.R. Part 200.} as set out at 2 C.F.R. 200.303:

(a) Establish and maintain effective internal control over the Federal award that provides reasonable assurance that [the recipient (and any subrecipient)] is managing the Federal award in compliance with Federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the Federal award. These internal controls should be in compliance with guidance in “Standards for Internal Control in the Federal Government” issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and the “Internal Control Integrated Framework”, issued by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (COSO).

(b) Comply with Federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the Federal awards.

(c) Evaluate and monitor [the recipient’s (and any subrecipient’s)] compliance with statutes, regulations and the terms and conditions of Federal awards.

(d) Take prompt action when instances of noncompliance are identified including noncompliance identified in audit findings.

(e) Take reasonable measures to safeguard protected personally identifiable information and other information the Federal awarding agency or pass-through entity designates as sensitive or [the recipient (or any subrecipient)] considers sensitive consistent with applicable Federal, state, local, and tribal laws regarding privacy and obligations of confidentiality.

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

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

\[15\]
Budget Information

What will not be funded:

- Applications primarily to purchase equipment, materials, or supplies. (A budget may include these items if they are necessary to conduct research, development, demonstration, evaluation, or analysis.)

- Applications that are not responsive to the categories of funding available in this specific solicitation.

Supplanting

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

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

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

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

Participant Support Costs and Incentives for Social Science Research

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

Cost Sharing or Matching Requirement

See “Cofunding” paragraph under item 4 (“Budget and Associated Documentation”) under What an Application Should Include in Section D. Application and Submission Information.
Pre-agreement Costs (also known as Pre-award Costs)

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

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

Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver

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

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

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

\(^{17}\) OJP does not apply this limitation on the use of award funds to the nonprofit organizations listed in Appendix VIII to 2 C.F.R. Part 200.
Prior Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conference/Meeting/Training Costs

OJP strongly encourages every applicant that proposes to use award funds for any conference-, meeting-, or training-related activity (or similar event) to review carefully—before submitting an application—the OJP policy and guidance on approval, planning, and reporting of such events, available at www.ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/PostawardRequirements/chapter3.10a.htm. OJP policy and guidance (1) encourage minimization of conference, meeting, and training costs; (2) require prior written approval (which may affect project timelines) of most conference, meeting, and training costs for cooperative agreement recipients and of some conference, meeting, and training costs for grant recipients; and (3) set cost limits, which include a general prohibition of all food and beverage costs.

Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable)

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

For additional information, see the "Civil Rights Compliance" section under “Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2017 Awards” in the OJP Funding Resource Center at https://ojp.gov/funding/index.htm.

C. Eligibility Information

For eligibility information, see title page.

For information on cost sharing or match requirements, see “What an Application Should Include” in Section D. Application and Submission Information.

D. Application and Submission Information

What an Application Should Include

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

Moreover, an applicant should anticipate that an application that OJP determines is nonresponsive to the scope of the solicitation, or that OJP determines does not include the application elements that NIJ has designated to be critical, will neither proceed to peer review nor receive further consideration. For this solicitation, NIJ has designated the following application elements as critical: Program Narrative, Budget Detail Worksheet, Budget Narrative, and resumes/curriculum vitae of key personnel. (For purposes of this solicitation, “key personnel” means the principal investigator, and any and all co-principal investigators.)
**NOTE:** OJP has combined the Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative in a single document collectively referred to as the Budget Detail Worksheet. See “Budget Information and Associated Documentation” below for more information about the Budget Detail Worksheet and where it can be accessed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. **Project Abstract**

   The project abstract is a very important part of the application, and serves as an introduction to the proposed project. NIJ uses the project abstract for a number of purposes, including assignment of the application to an appropriate review panel. If the application is funded, the project abstract typically will become public information and be used to describe the project.
Applications should include a high-quality project abstract that summarizes the proposed project in 250-400 words. Project abstracts not submitted in the template below should be—

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

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

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

3. **Program Narrative**

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

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

The following sections should be included as part of the program narrative.\(^\text{18}\)

**Program Narrative Guidelines:**

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

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

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

   If an applicant is resubmitting an application presented previously to NIJ, but not funded, the applicant should indicate this. A statement should be provided, no more than two pages, addressing: (1) the title, submission date, and NIJ-assigned

---

\(^{18}\) As noted earlier, if the proposed program or project reasonably could be conducted in discrete phases, with each phase resulting in completion of one or more significant, defined milestones, then NIJ strongly recommends that the applicant structure the application—specifically including the narrative, expected scholarly products, timelines/milestones, and budget detail worksheet and budget narrative—to set out each phase clearly. (In appropriate cases, the expected scholarly product(s) from a particular phase may vary from those described above.) See generally “Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products” under “Program-Specific Information,” above.
application number of the previous application, and (2) a brief summary of revisions to the application, including responses to previous feedback received from NIJ.

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

d. **Main Body**

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

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

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

- **Project Design and Implementation.** Applicants should provide a detailed description of the strategies to implement this research project and address the research questions. Design elements should follow directly from the research project’s goals and objectives and address the program-specific information noted on page 4. Applicants should describe the research methodology in detail and demonstrate the validity and usefulness of the data they will collect. Applicants should consider the rigor and soundness of the methodology and analytical and technical approaches for the proposed research and address the feasibility of the proposed project and potential challenges or problems in carrying out the activities.

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

  The discussion of impact should include a discussion of the deliverables, including planned scholarly products indicated in the program-specific information on page 15 and a plan for dissemination to appropriate audiences. Applicants should identify plans to produce or make available to broader interested practitioners and policy makers in a form that is designed to be readily accessible and useful to them.

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

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

o Experience producing and disseminating meaningful deliverables.

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

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

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

- Bibliography/references.

- Any tools/instruments, questionnaires, tables/charts/graphs, or maps pertaining to the proposed project that are supplemental to such items included in the main body of the narrative.

- Curriculum vitae or resume of the principal investigator and any and all co-principal investigators. In addition, curriculum vitae, resume, or biographical sketches of all other individuals (regardless of “investigator” status) who will be significantly involved in substantive aspects of the proposed project (including, for example, individuals such as statisticians used to conduct proposed data analysis).

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

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

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

- Proposed project timeline and expected milestones.

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

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

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

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

- Applicants proposing to use incentives or stipends payments as part of their research project design, must submit an incentive or stipend approval request, as a separate document, according to the requirements set forth at https://www.nij.gov/funding/Pages/research-participant-costs-and-incentives.aspx.

- Data archiving plan. Applicants should anticipate that NIJ will require (through special award conditions, that data sets resulting in whole or in part from projects funded under this solicitation be submitted for archiving with the NACJD. See www.nij.gov/funding/data-resources-program/applying/Pages/data-archiving-strategies.aspx.)
Applications should include as an appendix a brief plan – labeled “Data Archiving Plan” – to comply with data archiving requirements. The plan should provide brief details about proposed data management and archiving, including submission to NIJ (through NACJD) of all files and documentation necessary to allow for future efforts by others to reproduce the project’s findings and/or to extend the scientific value of the data set through secondary analysis. Pertinent files and documentation include, among other things, qualitative and quantitative data produced, instrumentation and data collection forms, codebook(s), any specialized programming code necessary to reproduce all constructed measures and the original data analysis, description of necessary de-identification procedures, and (when required) a copy of the privacy certificate and informed consent protocols.

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

Note that required data sets are to be submitted on or before the end date of the period of performance.

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

4. Budget and Associated Documentation

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

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

a. Budget Detail Worksheet

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

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

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

An applicant should demonstrate in its budget narrative how it will maximize cost effectiveness of award expenditures. Budget narratives should generally describe cost effectiveness in relation to potential alternatives and the goals of the project. For example, a budget narrative should detail why planned in-person meetings are necessary, or how technology and collaboration with outside organizations could be used to reduce costs, without compromising quality.

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

c. **Cofunding**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. Information on proposed subawards

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

e. Pre-Agreement Costs

For information on pre-agreement costs, see Section B. Federal Award Information.

5. Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable)

Indirect costs may be charged to an award only if:
(a) The recipient has a current (unexpired), federally approved indirect cost rate; or

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

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

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

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

6. Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8. Disclosure of Lobbying Activities

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

NIJ-2018-14140
9. Additional Attachments

a. Applicant disclosure of pending applications

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

b. Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity

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

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

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

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

OR

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

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

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

OR

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

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

How to Apply

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

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

Registering with Grants.gov is a one-time process; however, processing delays may occur, and it can take several weeks for first-time registrants to receive confirmation of registration and a user password. OJP encourages applicants to register several weeks before the application submission deadline. In addition, OJP urges applicants to submit applications at least 72 hours prior to the application due date, in order to allow time for the applicant to receive validation messages or rejection notifications from Grants.gov, and to correct in a timely fashion any problems that may have caused a rejection notification.

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

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

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

**Note on File Names and File Types:** Grants.gov only permits the use of certain specific characters in file names of attachments. Valid file names may include only the characters shown in the table below. Grants.gov rejects any application that includes an attachment(s) with a file name that contains any characters not shown in the table below. Grants.gov forwards successfully-submitted applications to the OJP Grants Management System (GMS).
GMS does not accept executable file types as application attachments. These disallowed file types include, but are not limited to, the following extensions: ".com," ".bat," ".exe," ".vbs," ".cfg," ".dat," ".db," ".dbf," ".dll," ".ini," ".log," ".ora," ".sys," and ".zip." GMS may reject applications with files that use these extensions. It is important to allow time to change the type of file(s) if the application is rejected.

All applicants are required to complete the following steps:

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

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

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

Applying as an Individual

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

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

Registration and Submission Steps

1. Acquire a unique entity identifier (currently, a DUNS number). In general, the Office of Management and Budget requires every applicant for a federal award (other than an individual) to include a "unique entity identifier" in each application, including an application for a supplemental award. Currently, a DUNS number is the required unique entity identifier.
This unique entity identifier is used for tracking purposes, and to validate address and point of contact information for applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. It will be used throughout the life cycle of an OJP award. Obtaining a DUNS number is a free, one-time activity. Call Dun and Bradstreet at 866–705–5711 to obtain a DUNS number or apply online at www.dnb.com. A DUNS number is usually received within 1-2 business days.

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

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

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

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

4. Acquire confirmation for the AOR from the E-Business Point of Contact (E-Biz POC). The E-Biz POC at the applicant organization must log into Grants.gov to “confirm” the applicant organization’s AOR. The E-Biz POC will need the Marketing Partner Identification Number (MPIN) password obtained when registering with SAM to complete this step. Note that an organization can have more than one AOR.

5. Search for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov. Use the following identifying information when searching for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov. The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number for this solicitation is 16.560; National Institute of Justice Research, Evaluation, and Development Project Grants and the funding opportunity number is NIJ-2018-14140.

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


- **Category 2: Demonstration, Evaluation, and Validation Tests for School Safety** — NIJ-2018-14142
7. **Access Funding Opportunity and Application Package from Grants.gov.** Select “Apply for Grants” under the “Applicants” column. Enter your email address to be notified of any changes to the opportunity package before the closing date. Click the Workspace icon to use Grants.gov Workspace.

8. **Submit a valid application consistent with this solicitation by following the directions in Grants.gov.** Within 24-48 hours after submitting the electronic application, the applicant should receive two notifications from Grants.gov. The first will confirm the receipt of the application. The second will state whether the application has been validated and successfully submitted, or whether it has been rejected due to errors, with an explanation. It is possible to first receive a message indicating that the application is received, and then receive a rejection notice a few minutes or hours later. Submitting an application well ahead of the deadline provides time to correct the problem(s) that caused the rejection. **Important:** OJP urges each applicant to submit its application at least 72 hours prior to the application due date, to allow time to receive validation messages or rejection notifications from Grants.gov, and to correct in a timely fashion any problems that may have caused a rejection notification. Applications must be successfully submitted through Grants.gov by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on May 7, 2018. Click [https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants/organization-registration.html](https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants/organization-registration.html) for further details on DUNS numbers, SAM, and Grants.gov registration steps and timeframes.

**Note: Application Versions**

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

**Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues**

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

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

The following conditions generally are insufficient to justify late submissions:

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

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

E. Application Review Information

Review Criteria

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

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

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

**Project Design and Implementation** (Quality and technical merit) – 40%

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

Potential Impact – 20%

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

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

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

1. Qualifications and experience of proposed project staff (that is, the principal investigator, any and all co-principal investigators, and all other individuals (and organizations) identified in the application (regardless of “investigator” status) who will be significantly involved in substantive aspects of the proposed project).

2. Demonstrated ability of the applicant organization to implement the proposed strategies and manage the effort.

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

Plan for Dissemination Strategy to broader audiences – 10%

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

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

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

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

Budget

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

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

Review Process

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

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

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

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

Peer review panels will evaluate, score, and rate applications that meet basic minimum requirements. NIJ may use internal peer reviewers, external peer reviewers, or a combination, to assess applications on technical merit using the solicitation’s review criteria. An external peer reviewer is an expert in the subject matter of a given solicitation who is not a current DOJ employee. An internal reviewer is a current DOJ employee who is well-versed or has expertise in the subject matter of this solicitation. Peer reviewers’ ratings and any resulting recommendations are advisory only, although reviewer views are considered carefully. Other important considerations for NIJ include geographic diversity, strategic priorities, and available funding, as well as the planned scholarly products and the extent to which the budget detail worksheet and budget narrative accurately explain project costs that are reasonable, necessary, and otherwise allowable under federal law and applicable federal cost principles.
Pursuant to the Part 200 Uniform Requirements, before award decisions are made, OJP also
reviews information related to the degree of risk posed by applicants. Among other things to
help assess whether an applicant that has one or more prior federal awards has a satisfactory
record with respect to performance, integrity, and business ethics, OJP checks whether the
applicant is listed in SAM as excluded from receiving a federal award. In addition, if OJP
anticipates that an award will exceed $150,000 in federal funds, OJP also must review and
consider any information about the applicant that appears in the non-public segment of the
integrity and performance system accessible through SAM (currently, the Federal Awardee
Performance and Integrity Information System; "FAPIIS").

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

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

1. Applicant financial stability and fiscal integrity.

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

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

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

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

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

F. Federal Award Administration Information

Federal Award Notices

Award notifications will be made by September 30, 2018. OJP sends award notifications by
email through GMS to the individuals listed in the application as the point of contact and the
authorizing official (E-Biz POC and AOR). The email notification includes detailed instructions
on how to access and view the award documents, and steps to take in GMS to start the award
acceptance process. GMS automatically issues the notifications at 9:00 p.m. eastern time on
the award date.
For each successful applicant, an individual with the necessary authority to bind the applicant will be required to login; execute a set of legal certifications and a set of legal assurances; designate a financial point of contact; thoroughly review the award, including all award conditions; and sign and accept the award. The award acceptance process requires physical signature of the award document by the authorized representative and the scanning and submission of the fully-executed award document to OJP.

**Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements**

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

Applicants should consult the “Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2017 Awards,” available in the OJP Funding Resource Center at [https://ojp.gov/funding/index.htm](https://ojp.gov/funding/index.htm). In addition, applicants should examine the following two legal documents, as each successful applicant must execute both documents before it may receive any award funds. (An applicant is not required to submit these documents as part of an application.)

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

- **Certified Standard Assurances.**

The webpages accessible through the “Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2017 Awards” are intended to give applicants for OJP awards a general overview of important statutes, regulations, and award conditions that apply to many (or in some cases, all) OJP grants and cooperative agreements awarded in FY 2018. Individual OJP awards typically also will include additional award conditions. Those additional conditions may relate to the particular statute, program, or solicitation under which the award is made; to the substance of the funded application; to the recipient’s performance under other federal awards; to the recipient’s legal status (e.g., as a for-profit entity); or to other pertinent considerations.

As stated above, NIJ expects that it will make any award under this solicitation in the form of a grant or cooperative agreement.

Any award made as a cooperative agreement will include a condition in the award document that sets out the nature of the “substantial federal involvement” in carrying out the award and program. Generally stated, under OJP cooperative agreement awards, responsibility for the day-to-day conduct of the funded project rests with the recipient. OJP, however, may have substantial involvement in matters such as substantive coordination of technical efforts and site selection, as well as review and approval of project work plans, research designs, data collection instruments, and major project-generated materials. In addition, OJP often indicates in the award terms and conditions that it may redirect the project if necessary.
In addition to an award condition that sets out the nature of the anticipated “substantial federal involvement” in the award, cooperative agreements awarded by OJP include an award condition the requires specific reporting in connection with conferences, meetings, retreats, seminars, symposium, training activities, or similar events funded under the award.

**General Information About Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements**

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

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

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

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

**G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)**

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

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

**H. Other Information**


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

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

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

**Provide Feedback to OJP**

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

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

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

FY 2018 Comprehensive School Safety Initiative

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

What an Applicant Should Do:

Prior to Registering in Grants.gov:

- Acquire a DUNS Number (see page 38)
- Acquire or renew registration with SAM (see page 39)

To Register with Grants.gov:

- Acquire AOR and Grants.gov username/password (see page 39)
- Acquire AOR confirmation from the E-Biz POC (see page 39)

To Find Funding Opportunity:

- Search for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov (see page 39)
- Select the correct Competition ID (see page 39)
- Access Funding Opportunity and Application Package (see page 40)
- Sign up for Grants.gov email notifications (optional) (see page 37)
- 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 22)

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 40)

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 40)

Overview of Post-Award Legal Requirements:


Scope Requirement:

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

Eligibility Requirement: See cover page.

What an Application Should Include:

- Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) (see page 23)
- Project Abstract (if applicable) (see page 23)
- Program Narrative (critical element) (see page 24)
- Budget Detail Worksheet (critical element) (see page 28)
- Budget Narrative (critical element) (see page 29)
- Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable) (see page 31)
Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable) (see page 32)
Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire (see page 32)
Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL) (see page 33)
Additional Attachments
   Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications (see page 34)
   Curriculum vitae or resume (critical element) (see page 26)
   Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity (see page 35)
Request and Justification for Employee Compensation; Waiver (if applicable) (see page 21)