

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
Bureau of Justice Assistance



The [U.S. Department of Justice](#) (DOJ), [Office of Justice Programs](#) (OJP) [Bureau of Justice Assistance](#) (BJA) is seeking applications for funding associated with the principles underpinning Project HOPE for: (1) states, localities, and tribes to implement or enhance a Swift, Certain, and Fair Supervision Program model; and (2) the Swift, Certain, and Fair Resource Center. This program furthers the Department's mission by reducing recidivism and therefore reducing crime as part of a comprehensive violent crime reduction strategy.

Innovative Responses to Behavior in the Community: Swift, Certain, and Fair Supervision FY 2018 Competitive Grant Announcement

Applications Due: May 14, 2018

Eligibility

Category 1: Eligible applicants are states, units of local government, and federally recognized Indian tribal governments (as determined by the Secretary of the Interior).

Category 2: Eligible applicants are limited to national-scope private and nonprofit organizations (including tribal nonprofit or for-profit organizations) and colleges and universities, both public and private (including tribal institutions of higher education).

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

BJA welcomes applications under which two or more entities would carry out the federal award; however, only one entity may be the applicant. Any others must be proposed as subrecipients (subgrantees).¹ The applicant must be the entity that would have primary responsibility for carrying out the award, including administering the funding and managing of the entire project.

BJA may elect to fund applications submitted under this fiscal year (FY) 2018 solicitation in future fiscal years, dependent on, among other considerations, the merit of the applications and on the availability of funding.

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

Deadline

Applicants must register with Grants.gov at <https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/register.html> prior to submitting an application. All applications are due by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on May 14, 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](#).

For additional information, see [How To Apply](#) in Section D. Application and Submission Information.

Contact Information

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

An applicant that experiences unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond its control that prevent it from submitting its application by the deadline must email the contact identified below **within 24 hours after the application deadline** to request approval to submit its application after the deadline. Additional information on reporting technical issues appears under “Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues” in the [How To Apply](#) section.

For assistance with any unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond an applicant’s control that prevent it from submitting its application by the deadline, or any other requirement of this solicitation, contact the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) Response Center: toll-free at 800-851-3420; via TTY at 301-240-6310 (hearing impaired only); email grants@ncjrs.gov; fax to 301-240-5830; or web chat at <https://webcontact.ncjrs.gov/ncjchat/chat.jsp>. The NCJRS Response Center hours of operation are 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. eastern time, Monday through Friday, and 10:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. eastern time on the solicitation close date.

Grants.gov number assigned to this solicitation: BJA-2018-13614

Release date: March 30, 2018

Contents

A. Program Description	4
Overview	4
Project-specific Information	4
Objectives and Deliverables (Category 1)	7
Objectives and Deliverables (Category 2)	9
Evidence-based Programs or Practices	11
Information Regarding Potential Evaluation of Programs and Activities	12
B. Federal Award Information	12
Type of Award	12
Financial Management and System of Internal Controls	13
Budget Information	14
Cost Sharing or Matching Requirement	14
Pre-agreement Costs (also known as Pre-award Costs)	14
Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver	15
Prior Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conference/Meeting/Training Costs	15
Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable)	16
C. Eligibility Information	16
D. Application and Submission Information	16
What an Application Should Include	16
How To Apply	29
E. Application Review Information	33
Review Criteria	33
Review Process	34
F. Federal Award Administration Information	36
Federal Award Notices	36
Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements	36
General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements	37
G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)	38
H. Other Information	38
Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552 and 5 U.S.C. 552a)	38
Provide Feedback to OJP	38
Appendix A: Performance Measures	40
Appendix B: Swift, Certain, and Fair Supervision Program Resource Materials	43
Appendix C: Possible Members of the SCF Supervision Team	44
Appendix D: Sample Program and Research Model	46
Appendix E: Application Checklist	47

Innovative Responses to Behavior in the Community: Swift, Certain, and Fair Supervision

CFDA # 16.828

A. Program Description

Overview

The purpose of the Innovative Responses to Behavior in the Community: Swift, Certain, and Fair (SCF) Supervision Program (SCF Program) is to provide state and local parole and probation agencies with information, resources, and training and technical assistance (TTA) to improve responses to offender behavior in accordance with the principles of swiftness, certainty, and fairness to prevent recidivism and reduce crime in their jurisdictions.

Through this grant announcement, BJA will select multiple applicants to develop, implement, or enhance an SCF Program model (Category 1). BJA will also select a TTA provider to support the Category 1 grantees and the field at large, and to operate a national resource center (Category 2).

Statutory Authority:

Awards under this solicitation will be made under statutory authority provided by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018.

Project-specific Information

At year-end 2015, an estimated 4.6 million adults were under court supervision—the equivalent of about 1 out of every 53 adults in the United States.² Many do not successfully complete parole or probation because they either fail to comply with their parole or probation conditions or they commit a new crime. Comprehensive crime prevention and public safety strategies must attend to this population, whose contact with the justice system is an opportunity to intervene and decrease the likelihood they will commit future crimes.

This solicitation leverages parole and probation agencies' abilities to assist in reducing crimes committed by those supervised in the community by utilizing the swift, certain, and fair principles of intervention. The SCF principles are: **swiftness**—responding to behavior promptly so that offenders connect the response to their behavior; **certainty**—consistency and predictability of sanctions; and **fairness**—making sanctions proportionate to negative behavior.

These principles can have a positive impact by reducing antisocial and criminal behavior; enhancing offenders' perceptions that supervision decisions are fair, which increases compliance; and increasing collaboration with justice partners. Research shows that taken together, these yield reductions in recidivism and therefore improve public safety. Swiftness,

²Probation and Parole in the United States (2015). Bureau of Justice Statistics, <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/ppus15.pdf>.

certainty, and fairness in criminal justice responses are longstanding principles in parole and probation.

The overall purpose of the SCF Program is to expand those principles and test new implementations of SCF responses to increase probation and parole success rates. Additionally, the SCF Program seeks to reduce the number of crimes committed by those under probation and parole supervision, which would in turn reduce crime, decrease admissions to prisons and jails (in a safe, responsible manner), and save taxpayer dollars.

The SCF Program is grounded in research that shows that crime generally is committed by people for whom deferred and low probability threats of severe punishment are less effective than immediate and high probability threats of mild punishment. In addition, a broad body of behavioral research shows that swift and certain rewards for positive behavior can be a powerful incentive to comply with rules.³ Swift and certain responses to violating terms of probation send a consistent message to probationers about personal responsibility and accountability. Last, research has shown that swift and consistent responses to behaviors improve the perception that the system is fair and increases compliance.⁴

Given the growing body of research and practice reinforcing the potential of approaches that employ the core SCF principles, BJA is issuing this solicitation to support jurisdictions and agencies interested in developing or enhancing their SCF efforts with implementation models informed by research and responsive to local circumstances. However, every jurisdiction has a unique set of circumstances—the problem(s), environment, and resources are different, and those differences should be reflected in design decisions. For example, the target population, type of recidivism, time from offender behavior to reward or sanction, types of sanctions available, and the level of collaboration among justice partners (e.g., parole and judges) vary by jurisdiction, so their starting points, proposed grant activities, and target outcomes should vary as well. Also, the program design and implementation should incorporate stakeholder input (which includes the voices of individuals under supervision) to yield locally conceived and implemented SCF initiatives that comport with perceptions of fairness.

Hawaii Opportunity Probation with Enforcement (HOPE) Program

Many efforts have been made to improve adherence to the SCF principles over the last two decades. The Hawaii Opportunity Probation with Enforcement (HOPE)⁵ Program, which started in 2004, is the best known large scale implementation of SCF principles. The HOPE model was designed to address particular concerns in Honolulu such as high rates of methamphetamine use among moderate-to-high risk probationers and inadequate means for probation to respond short of revocation, leading to high use of prison under Hawaii's strict sentencing practices. Compared to the status quo, HOPE dramatically improves the **swiftness** and **certainty** of sanctions for technical violations by adding regular random drug tests, delivering administrative responses within days of a detected violation (rather than allowing more than a dozen violations to pile up over a year or more), and quickly imposing brief jail stays (typically 3 days). Continued compliance is rewarded with reduced drug testing and early termination from supervision, and non-jail sanctions are employed for minor violations by otherwise compliant probationers. Drug treatment is mandated after several positive tests or at the probationer's request. By addressing

³ See Appendix B.

⁴ Information from the National Institute of Justice, <https://www.nij.gov/topics/corrections/community/drug-offenders/pages/hawaii-hope.aspx>.

⁵ Rated "promising" by CrimeSolutions.gov, see <https://www.crimesolutions.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?ID=49>.

every violation made by program participants and responding quickly, HOPE sends a consistent message to probationers about personal responsibility. After 1 year, HOPE probationers were 55 percent less likely to be arrested for a new crime; 72 percent less likely to use drugs; 61 percent less likely to skip appointments with their supervisory officers; and 53 percent less likely to have their probation revoked.⁶

Following that success, BJA partnered with the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) to test HOPE in four mainland jurisdictions. Initial outcome findings varied across the sites, and underscore the importance of weighing local needs, structure, and laws in developing SCF strategies.

HOPE is just one implementation of the SCF principles which have been implemented in many other jurisdictions—some adopting HOPE policies and practices more or less wholesale; some adapting to local circumstances with substantial variation; and some starting with a blank slate.⁷ Evaluations of these iterations have shown promise as well as illuminated challenges to successful implementation and improved outcomes.

Please check the following link for SCF-related research:

<http://scfcenter.org/resources/resources-research.php>.

Innovations Suite

The SCF Program is part of BJA's Innovations in Public Safety portfolio, also known as the "Innovations Suite." BJA's [Innovations Suite](#) of programs invests in the development of practitioner-researcher partnerships that use data, evidence, and innovation to create strategies that are effective and economical.⁸ This data-driven approach enables jurisdictions to understand the full nature and extent of the crime challenges they are facing and to direct resources to the highest priorities. The Innovations Suite of programs represents a strategic approach that leverages innovative applications of analysis, technology, and evidence-based practices with the goal of improving performance and making America safer.

Innovations Suite programs, including SCF, are advised to conduct research and evaluation to:

- Develop strategies and partnerships to reduce crime.
- Enhance implementation and accountability.
- Analyze data to focus resources.
- Build communities of practice.
- Sustain effective strategies and initiatives.

Successful partnerships between practitioners and researchers require investments of planning, time, communication, complementary skills, and adequate resources.⁹

Through this solicitation, BJA seeks applicants in two categories. Both have specific objectives and deliverables described under their respective Category headings:

⁶ Hawken, A., & Kleiman, M. (2009). Managing drug involved probationers with swift and certain sanctions: Evaluating Hawaii's HOPE. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

⁷ Hawken, A., & Kulick, J. (2016). Implementation issues in swift certain fair supervision. Perspectives, Spring: 64–77.

⁸ For more information about the Innovations Suite of programs, see:

<https://www.bja.gov/Programs/CRPPE/>.

⁹ For guidance about identifying and working with a research partner, see:

<http://www.psnmsu.com/documents/ResearchPartnerQ&A.pdf>.

- Category 1: Implementing and Testing the SCF Principles
- Category 2: Swift, Certain, and Fair Resource Center

Category 1: Implementing and Testing the SCF Principles. Competition ID: BJA-2018-13901

BJA seeks applicants to develop and enhance SCF principles and implement an SCF Responses Program model to reduce recidivism and provide better outcomes for program participants. Grant funds should be used to establish, expand, or improve SCF strategies to be sustained by the applicant after the award period.

Objectives and Deliverables (Category 1)

In order to develop, implement, and sustain SCF-informed strategies, BJA will make up to four awards to applicants to pursue the following objectives:

- Develop and implement supervision strategies based on the SCF principles, including responses to positive and negative client behavior.
- Evaluate the efficacy of those strategies to reduce recidivism.
- Increase the number of supervision decisions (e.g., assignment of conditions of supervision and responses to violations of those conditions, responses to antisocial behavior that do not rise to the level of violating conditions of supervision) that are fair and consistently applied, and with consequences that are transparent.
- Promote and increase collaboration among agencies and officials who work in probation, parole, pretrial, law enforcement, treatment, reentry, and related fields.
- Develop a plan to sustain effective SCF supervision strategies and related collaborations beyond the award period.
- Develop and implement strategies for the identification, targeting, supervision, and treatment of “high risk/high needs” offenders who are being supervised in the community. (This should include a preliminary assessment of whether those high risk/need offenders are also violent offenders who might not be suitable for community supervision).
- Increase the number of participants in programs, based on the SCF model, who believe that the supervision decisions are fair and consistently applied, and the consequences are transparent.

The required deliverables are:

- An “action plan” consisting of a problem analysis, program and evaluation model, summary of strategies and intended outcomes, and a research base for the proposed strategies within 6 months of award. The action plan is envisioned as a product of collaboration among the grantee, supervision agency (if not the grantee), research partner (if applicable), and the SCF Resource Center. For more information about the required action plan, see page 14.
- Written policies or procedures that demonstrate operational changes, as they relate to the project.
- A sustainability plan to demonstrate the SCF strategies and collaborations will continue beyond the award period. The plan should use outcome data to establish the case for continuing the SCF work, identify needed resources to sustain it, and describe how those needs will be met.

- A midterm analysis and report, based on the program and evaluation model (at 18 months).
- A final analysis and report .based on the program and evaluation model.

Consistent with the objectives and deliverables outlined above, applicants should include in their proposals:

- A summary description of the problem to be addressed through this grant.
- A clear demonstration of understanding the SCF principles and the model that is being proposed for consideration.
- A clear demonstration that the applicant and its partners have the authority to implement the required elements of the model, including decision-making about the terms of supervision; the capacity to assess and effectively target moderate-to-high risk offenders; the capacity to issue and serve warrants quickly; drug testing capacity; and access to jail beds, treatment, and other services, as needed.
- Letters on official letterhead that demonstrate a commitment to the proposed initiative, to include the following, if they are members of the applicant's SCF team:¹⁰
 - Chief judge
 - Parole and probation directors
 - Court administrator
 - Lead prosecutor or district attorney
 - Public defender
 - Chief of police or sheriff
 - Jail administrator
 - Other essential partners, consistent with the proposed application and circumstances of the applicant's jurisdiction
- A clear demonstration that the applicant understands the action research approach to: collect and analyze data; monitor sanctions, rewards, violations, and recidivism; provide regular report-outs to the SCF team; assess the progress of the SCF initiative; provide data to the SCF Resource Center; and assist the SCF team with timely, complete, and accurate reporting of performance measures.
- Demonstration of agency-wide commitment to align policies and practices with recidivism reduction, public safety goals, and continuous quality improvement.
- Commitment to hire a **fulltime**, onsite program coordinator to manage the day-to-day operations of the SCF project. The program coordinator should be housed in the parole and probation office, have experience working in the field of criminal justice, and have proven capacity to work effectively with key SCF team members, including the chief judge, court staff, parole and probation, law enforcement, and other partners, where applicable. The program coordinator will work closely with the SCF Resource Center team and the team's research partner (if applicable) to:
 - Build the infrastructure, including policies and procedures, to implement the SCF model.
 - Monitor the implementation of the SCF model.
 - Identify the TTA needs of SCF team members.
 - Continually assess fidelity to the SCF model.
 - Facilitate communication and logistics among the site's SCF team members.
 - Identify, collect, and analyze SCF administrative and program data.

¹⁰ See Appendix C for the roles and responsibilities of key members of an SCF team. If your initiative/model does not use one of the key members listed, please be sure to explain the roles and responsibilities of the key members of your proposed team.

- Respond to requests for data, reports, and information about the SCF initiative.
- Ensure that the SCF team meets regularly so all the members remain informed of the project's status and developments.

Priority Consideration

Priority consideration will be given to applicants that:

- (1) Propose an SCF initiative to reduce violent crime. Applicants are encouraged to propose strategies to reduce recidivism among high risk offenders under supervision who have a history of serious violence and are identified in concert with local and/or state law enforcement. Proposals must include a description of how this group will be identified and demonstrate access to and use of data and law enforcement input.
- (2) Propose an approach to assess how their agency's supervision practices align with the Risk-Needs-Responsivity (RNR) framework and improve alignment as it relates to the target population proposed for the SCF initiative. For example, agencies may use the RNR Simulation Tool,¹¹ or something similar, to assess capacity to provide risk-reducing programs to the target population; then revise program offerings and content based on the results.

Training and Technical Assistance for SCF supervision awardees

TTA will be provided by the SCF Resource Center team. The SCF Resource Center team will help each site that receives BJA funding to:

- Understand the importance of each component of a SCF model.
- Develop focused strategies.
- Develop a plan to assess and monitor fidelity.
- Provide training and coaching for team members to enhance program fidelity.
- Understand adaptation and prevent program "drift."¹²
- Collect, analyze, interpret, and disseminate data on program outcomes.
- Encourage collaboration.

Category 2: Swift, Certain, and Fair Resource Center. Competition ID: BJA-2018-13902

BJA seeks a highly qualified team of experts to provide training, technical assistance, coaching, and SCF-fidelity oversight to new and previously funded grantees so they can appropriately assess their needs, develop focused strategies, understand the importance of each component of an SCF model, encourage collaboration, and implement their strategies with fidelity. The TTA provider will be expected to work closely with the grantees funded by BJA in Category 1, as well as up to 13 grantees previously funded, and to also work closely with three to four nongrantee jurisdictions to help them establish and implement SCF initiatives with fidelity.

Implementation fidelity is important to the success of SCF initiatives. It is only when effective practices are implemented with fidelity that positive outcomes can be expected. The TTA provider will be responsible for assisting jurisdictions with identifying, assessing, and adhering to the key components of the SCF approach. The TTA provider will also help BJA develop plans and provide coaching for jurisdictions to monitor fidelity of implementation, to understand adaptation and prevent program "drift," and to measure implementation and outcomes. The TTA provider will also provide coaching for grantee jurisdictions to develop sustainability plans and

¹¹ See <https://www.gmuace.org/tools/>.

¹² This can occur when key components of the model are revised that may not support the objectives of the program, or when attention or commitment to the program starts to wane.

communicate them to relevant stakeholders before the end of their award periods. This assistance is critical to support the effective implementation of SCF initiatives.

The TTA provider will also be expected to provide more general training for the field through webinars, group interactions at conferences or workshops, teleconferences, peer-to-peer consultations, distance learning, and/or web-based assistance.

Objectives and Deliverables (Category 2)

To support the development, implementation, and sustainment of SCF-informed strategies, BJA will select a TTA provider to pursue the following objectives:

- Operate the SCF Resource Center, a collection of experts, resources, and assistance accessible online.
- Assist new (FY 2018) and existing grantees in BJA's SCF Responses Program to complete the objectives and deliverables, as outlined in Category 1, to: develop high performing programs; maintain fidelity to the SCF principles and proposed implementation strategies specific to grantees; develop and track performance measures; collect "real time" feedback and conduct evaluations; and develop and communicate sustainability plans.
- Document implementation lessons learned to advance the state of knowledge about what works, and how it works.

The required deliverables are:

- A guide or template to assist new grantees in developing action plans that will serve as a blueprint to implement their projects. The guide should be designed to capture a problem analysis, program and evaluation models, a summary of strategies and intended outcomes, and a research base for the proposed strategies. It should be available to grantees within 30 days after this TTA award. Grantees will be required to submit action plans to BJA within 180 days of award. See page 14 for more information.
- After-action reports for each onsite TTA engagement.
- A series of resources, such as publications, technical assistance plans, reports, webinars, and other resources, that meet the priority needs of policymakers and practitioners in responding to offender behavior.
- Protocols to help jurisdictions have a clear understanding of SCF principles, common program elements, and related issues.
- A process and materials to ensure that the SCF principles are implemented with fidelity.
- Maintaining and updating the SCF Resource Center website.

BJA expects that the TTA provider will develop the above deliverables in consultation with BJA.

Consistent with the objectives and deliverables outlined above, applicants should include in their proposals:

- A summary description of the problem to be addressed through the TTA, progress made to date, and the need for further support to respond to offender behavior.
- A description of the assistance and training activities to be deployed, which directly relate to the objectives and deliverables outlined in Category 1 of this solicitation.
- A plan to develop and disseminate a model and guide based on extant literature, experience of the sites, and other relevant sources.

- A plan to assess and approve requests from non-grantee jurisdictions requesting TTA.

The Objectives and Deliverables for both Categories 1 and 2 are directly related to the performance measures that demonstrate the results of the work completed, as discussed in [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#), under Program Narrative.

TTA Provider Requirements for Category 2

BJA TTA providers are required to coordinate all TTA activities with BJA's National Training and Technical Assistance Center (NTTAC). The successful applicant will be required to comply with NTTAC protocols in order to ensure coordinated delivery of services among TTA providers and effective use of BJA TTA grant funding. BJA reserves the right to reasonably modify these protocols at any time, at its discretion.

TTA providers may be required to participate in BJA's GrantStat. Through GrantStat, BJA management and staff examine the performance of the grant programs funded by BJA by tracking grantee or program performance along several key indicators. GrantStat calls for the collection and analysis of performance data and other relevant grant-level information that enables BJA as well as its TTA partners to be held accountable for the grantee's and program's performance as measured against the program's objectives. In addition, the TTA provider will be required to assist grantees in the collection of performance measurement data.

Last, BJA expects all TTA providers to make ongoing recommendations to BJA on relevant criminal justice research and ways to improve assistance delivered through this solicitation, as well as to coordinate with other BJA TTA providers working in related subject areas or in overlapping jurisdictions to ensure maximum impact of BJA-funded TTA.

Evidence-based Programs or Practices

OJP strongly emphasizes the use of data and evidence in policy making and program development in criminal justice, juvenile justice, and crime victim services. OJP is committed to:

- Improving the quantity and quality of evidence OJP generates.
- Integrating evidence into program, practice, and policy decisions within OJP and the field.
- Improving the translation of evidence into practice.

OJP considers programs and practices to be evidence-based when their effectiveness has been demonstrated by causal evidence, generally obtained through one or more outcome evaluations. Causal evidence documents a relationship between an activity or intervention (including technology) and its intended outcome, including measuring the direction and size of a change, and the extent to which a change may be attributed to the activity or intervention. Causal evidence depends on the use of scientific methods to rule out, to the extent possible, alternative explanations for the documented change. The strength of causal evidence, based on the factors described above, will influence the degree to which OJP considers a program or practice to be evidence-based.

The OJP CrimeSolutions.gov website at <https://www.crimesolutions.gov> is one resource that applicants may use to find information about evidence-based programs in criminal justice, juvenile justice, and crime victim services.

Action research partnerships between researchers and practitioners have great potential to improve practice and policy. NIJ published findings of the Research-Practitioner Partnerships Study, which documents, synthesizes, and shares what makes partnerships between researchers and practitioners successful. See “[Recommendations for Collaborating Successfully With Academic Researchers, Findings from the Researcher-Practitioner Partnerships Study \(RPPS\)](#).”

For information related to implementation science, applicants may wish to refer to the [National Implementation Research Network](#) website.

Information Regarding Potential Evaluation of Programs and Activities

The Department of Justice has prioritized the use of evidence-based programming and deems it critical to continue to build and expand the evidence informing criminal and juvenile justice programs to reach the highest level of rigor possible. Therefore, applicants should note that the Office of Justice Programs may conduct or support an evaluation of the programs and activities funded under this solicitation. Recipients and sub-recipients will be expected to cooperate with program-related assessments or evaluation efforts, including through the collection and provision of information or data requested by OJP (or its designee) for the assessment or evaluation of any activities and/or outcomes of those activities funded under this solicitation. The information or data requested may be in addition to any other financial or performance data already required under this program.

B. Federal Award Information

BJA expects to make awards in each category for the following amounts:

- **Category 1:** up to four awards of up to \$600,000 each, with an estimated total amount awarded of up to \$2,400,000
- **Category 2:** one award of up to \$865,000

All awards are for a 36-month period of performance to begin on or about October 1, 2018.

BJA may, in certain cases, provide additional funding in future years to awards made under this solicitation, 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

Category 1

BJA expects to make any award under this solicitation in the form of a grant. See [Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements](#), under [Section F. Federal Award](#)

[Administration Information](#), for a brief discussion of important statutes, regulations, and award conditions that apply to many (or in some cases, all) OJP grants.

Category 2

BJA expects to make any award under this solicitation in the form of a cooperative agreement, which is a type of award that provides for OJP to have substantial involvement in carrying out award activities. See [Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements](#), under [Section F. Federal Award Administration Information](#), for a brief discussion of what may constitute substantial federal involvement.

Financial Management and System of Internal Controls

Award recipients and subrecipients (including recipients or subrecipients that are pass-through entities¹³) must, as described in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements¹⁴ 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 the 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 award recipients.)

¹³ For purposes of this solicitation, the phrase “pass-through entity” includes any recipient or subrecipient that provides a subaward (“subgrant”) to a subrecipient (subgrantee) to carry out part of the funded award or program. Additional information on proposed subawards is listed under [What an Application Should Include](#), Section 4c of this solicitation.

¹⁴ 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.

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 a questionnaire—the [OJP Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire](#)—that OJP requires **all** applicants (other than an individual applying in his/her personal capacity) to download, complete, and submit as part of the application.

Budget Information

Cost Sharing or Matching Requirement

This solicitation does not require a match. However, 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.

Category 1: Award Special Condition – Withholding of Funds for BJA Action Plan

Once awarded, each grant award will have in place a special condition withholding all but \$200,000, which will allow grantees to establish an action plan within 180 days of receiving final approval of the project's budget from the Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO). The recipient will not be authorized to obligate, expend, or draw down funds in excess of \$200,000 until BJA has reviewed and approved the action plan and a Grant Adjustment Notice has been issued and approved to remove the special condition. The action plan must include:

- A comprehensive project work plan based on a guide provided by BJA's TTA provider—the Swift, Certain, and Fair Resource Center—which will guide each grantee in developing the action plan that incorporates the SCF principles and meets the objectives set forth above under Category 1. A completed action plan will include:
 - A description of the problem and the data that led to its identification.
 - A research and evaluation model that identifies the solution(s) to be tested, intended outcomes, and evaluation metrics, including the research base for proposed strategies (See Appendix D).
 - A plan to implement the model, including agencies and actors responsible for revising or developing policy and changing practice.
 - An evaluation plan, to include ongoing analysis, monitoring, and assessment of the overall project impact.
- A contract, memorandum of understanding, or other agreement that clearly delineates the role and responsibilities of the research partner, if applicable. This document should establish the authority of the research partner to access agency data, interview personnel, and monitor operations that are relevant to the evaluation of the initiative.
- Letters of commitment from external agencies or organizations that are expected to participate in the project, to the extent that letters have not already been provided.
- Demonstrated executive support and commitment of agency resources to the project.

For additional information on cost sharing and match, see the DOJ Grants Financial Guide at <https://ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/PostawardRequirements/chapter3.3b.htm>.

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.¹⁵ The 2018 salary table for SES employees is available on 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 Assistant Attorney General for OJP may exercise discretion to waive, on an individual basis, this limitation on compensation rates allowable under an award. An applicant that requests a waiver should include a detailed justification in the Budget Narrative of its application. An applicant that does not submit a waiver request and justification with its application should anticipate that OJP will require the applicant to adjust and resubmit the budget.

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

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

OJP strongly encourages every applicant that proposes to use award funds for any conference-, meeting-, or training-related activity (or similar event) to review carefully—before submitting an application—the OJP and DOJ policy and guidance on approval, planning, and reporting of such events, available at <https://www.ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/PostawardRequirements/chapter3.10a.htm>. OJP policy

¹⁵ 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.

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, as well as some conference, meeting, and training costs for grant recipients; and (3) set cost limits, which include a general prohibition of all food and beverage costs.

Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable)

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

For additional information, see the "Civil Rights Compliance" section under "[Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2018 Awards](#)" in the OJP Funding Resource Center at <https://ojp.gov/funding/index.htm>.

C. Eligibility Information

For eligibility information, see title page.

For information on cost sharing or match requirements, see [Section B. Federal Award 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 BJA has designated to be critical, will neither proceed to peer review, nor receive further consideration. For this solicitation, BJA has designated the following application elements as critical: Abstract, Program Narrative, Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative, and résumés/curricula vitarum of key personnel.

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,"

“Résumés” for all attachments. Also, OJP recommends that applicants include résumés 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 the OJP 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 8b exactly as it appears on the prior year award document. An applicant with a current, active award(s) must ensure that its GMS profile is current. If the profile is not current, the applicant should submit a Grant Adjustment Notice updating the information on its GMS profile prior to applying under this solicitation.

A new applicant entity should enter its official legal name in box 8a, its address in box 8d, its EIN in box 8b, and its Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number in box 8c of the SF-424. A new applicant entity should attach official legal documents to its application (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

Applications should include a high quality project abstract that summarizes the proposed project in 400 words or less. Project abstracts should be:

- Written for a general public audience.
- Submitted as a separate attachment with “Project Abstract” as part of its file name.
- Single-spaced, using a standard 12-point font (such as Times New Roman) with 1-inch margins.
- **Clearly labeled, including the following information:**
 - Legal name of the grant recipient and the title of the project.
 - Project’s objectives and deliverables.
 - Program design elements, including the allowable uses of funds that will be incorporated into the project.

- Mandatory program components.
- If applicable, the projected number of participants to be serviced through the project and target population characteristics. (Category 1 only)
- Baseline recidivism rate. (Category 1 only)
- Name of the validated risk assessment tool used. (Category 1 only)

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

3. Program Narrative

The program narrative should be double-spaced, using a standard 12-point font (Times New Roman preferred); have 1-inch margins; and should not exceed 15 pages. Pages should be numbered “1 of 15,” “2 of 15,” etc. If the program narrative fails to comply with these length-related restrictions, BJA may consider such noncompliance in peer review and in final award decisions.

The following sections should be included as part of the program narrative:¹⁶

- a. Description of the Issue
- b. Project Design and Implementation
- c. Capabilities and Competencies
- d. Plan for Collecting the Data Required for this Solicitation’s 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](#)). The performance data directly relate to the objectives and deliverables identified under "Objectives and Deliverables" in [Section A. Program Description](#).

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

For Category 1, post award, recipients will be required to submit quarterly performance metrics through BJA’s online Performance Measurement Tool (PMT), located at <https://bjapmt.ojp.gov>. Applicants should review the complete list of SCF performance measures at: https://bjapmt.ojp.gov/help/SCF_PerformanceMeasures.pdf.

For Category 2, post-award recipients will be required to submit performance metric data semiannually through BJA’s online Training and Technical Assistance Reporting Portal located at www.bjatrain.org.

¹⁶ For information on subawards (including the details on proposed subawards that should be included in the application), see "Budget and Associated Documentation" under [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#).

The performance measures can be found in [Appendix A](#) of this solicitation. More information on reporting requirements can be found at: <https://www.bjatrain.org/working-with-nttac/providers>.

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.

Note on Project Evaluations

An applicant that proposes to use award funds through this solicitation to conduct project evaluations should be aware that certain project evaluations (such as systematic investigations designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge) may constitute "research" for purposes of applicable DOJ human subjects protection regulations. However, project evaluations that are intended only to generate internal improvements to a program or service, or are conducted only to meet OJP's performance measure data reporting requirements, likely do not constitute "research." Each applicant should provide sufficient information for OJP to determine whether the particular project it proposes would either intentionally or unintentionally collect and/or use information in such a way that it meets the DOJ definition of research that appears at 28 C.F.R. Part 46 ("Protection of Human Subjects").

"Research," for purposes of human subjects protection for OJP-funded programs, is defined as "a systematic investigation, including research development, testing and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge." 28 C.F.R. 46.102(d).

For additional information on determining whether a proposed activity would constitute research for purposes of human subjects protection, applicants should consult the decision tree in the "Research and the protection of human subjects" section of the ["Requirements related to Research"](#) webpage of the ["Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2018 Awards,"](#) available through the OJP Funding Resource Center at <https://ojp.gov/funding/Explore/SolicitationRequirements/index.htm>.

Every prospective applicant whose application may propose a research or statistical component also should review the "Data Privacy and Confidentiality Requirements" section on that webpage.

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>.

Unallowable Uses for Award Funds

In addition to the unallowable costs identified in the [DOJ Grants Financial Guide](#), award funds may not be used for the following:

- Prizes, rewards, entertainment, trinkets (or any type of monetary incentive)
- Client stipends
- Gift cards
- Vehicles
- Food and beverage

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 objectives 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. 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.

d. 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 (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 (OCFO) Customer Service Center at 1-800-458-0786 or at ask.ocfo@usdoj.gov. If DOJ is the cognizant federal agency, applicants may obtain information needed to submit an indirect cost rate proposal at <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.

An applicant unable to submit an application that includes a fully executed (i.e., signed) copy of legal appropriate documentation, as described above, consistent with the applicable

tribe's governance structure, should, at a minimum, submit an unsigned, draft version of such legal documentation as part of its application (except for cases in which, with respect to a tribal consortium applicant, consortium bylaws allow action without the support of all consortium member tribes). If selected for funding, OJP will make use of and access to award funds contingent on receipt of the fully-executed legal documentation.

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

Every OJP applicant (other than an individual applying in his or her personal capacity) is required to download, complete, and submit the OJP Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire (Questionnaire) at

<https://ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/FinancialCapability.pdf> as part of its application.

The Questionnaire helps OJP assess the financial management and internal control systems, and the associated potential risks of an applicant as part of the pre-award risk assessment process.

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

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

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

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

8. Disclosure of Lobbying Activities

Each applicant must complete and submit this information. An applicant that expends any funds for lobbying activities is to provide all of the information requested on the form

Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL) posted at <https://ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/Disclosure.pdf>. An applicant that does not expend any funds for lobbying activities is to enter “N/A” in the text boxes for item 10 (“a. Name and Address of Lobbying Registrant” and “b. Individuals Performing Services”).

9. Additional Attachments

Category 1: Submit items a–e and h–j.

Category 2: Submit items a and d–j.

- a. **Timeline/Project Plan** outlining key tasks, benchmarks, and persons or entities responsible.
- b. **Letter From Lead Agency** (applicable only if the supervision agency is not the lead agency) demonstrating commitment to the project and to the research partnership.
- c. **Letter From Research Partner (if applicable)** demonstrating commitment to the project.
- d. **Letters of Support From All Other Key Partners (if applicable)** detailing the commitment to work with the applicant to promote the mission of the project.
- e. **Position Descriptions** for key roles. Position descriptions should relate to the role on the proposed project, not the person’s role within the applicant organization, and describe critical competencies and expectations regarding project responsibilities.
- f. **Résumés/curricula vitarum (CV)** for key personnel. Applicants may combine position descriptions and résumés into a single document; however, please note that résumés or CVs are one of the critical elements for an application, along with the program narrative and budget/budget narrative. Applications that do not include these elements shall neither proceed to peer review nor receive further consideration by BJA.
- g. **Examples of work products** including policy briefs, reports, websites, etc.
- h. **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 any identical cost items outlined in the budget submitted to OJP as part of the application under this solicitation. The applicant is to disclose applications made directly to federal awarding agencies, and also applications for subawards of federal funds (e.g., applications to state agencies that will subaward (“subgrant”) federal funds).

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

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

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

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

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

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

i. Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity

If 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.

j. Disclosure of Process Related to Executive Compensation

An applicant that is a nonprofit organization may be required to make certain disclosures relating to the processes it uses to determine the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees, and key employees.

Under certain circumstances, a nonprofit organization that provides unreasonably high compensation to certain persons may subject both the organization's managers and those who receive the compensation to additional federal taxes. A rebuttable presumption of the reasonableness of a nonprofit organization's compensation arrangements, however, may be available if the nonprofit organization satisfied certain rules set out in Internal Revenue Service (IRS) regulations with regard to its compensation decisions.

Each applicant nonprofit organization must state at the time of its application (question 9c in the "OJP Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire" located at <http://ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/FinancialCapability.pdf> and mentioned earlier) whether or not the applicant entity believes (or asserts) that it currently satisfies the requirements of 26 C.F.R. 53.4958-6 (which relate to establishing or invoking a rebuttable presumption of reasonableness of compensation of certain individuals and entities).

A nonprofit organization that states in the questionnaire that it believes (or asserts) that it has satisfied the requirements of 26 C.F.R. 53.4958-6 must then disclose, in an attachment to its application (to be titled "Disclosure of Process Related to Executive Compensation"), the process used by the applicant nonprofit organization to

determine the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees, and key employees (together, "covered persons").

At a minimum, the disclosure must describe in pertinent detail: (1) the composition of the body that reviews and approves compensation arrangements for covered persons; (2) the methods and practices used by the applicant nonprofit organization to ensure that no individual with a conflict of interest participates as a member of the body that reviews and approves a compensation arrangement for a covered person; (3) the appropriate data as to comparability of compensation that is obtained in advance and relied upon by the body that reviews and approves compensation arrangements for covered persons; and (4) the written or electronic records that the applicant organization maintains as concurrent documentation of the decisions with respect to compensation of covered persons made by the body that reviews and approves such compensation arrangements, including records of deliberations and of the basis for decisions.

For purposes of the required disclosure, the following terms and phrases have the meanings set out by the IRS for use in connection with 26 C.F.R. 53.4958-6: officers, directors, trustees, key employees, compensation, conflict of interest, appropriate data as to comparability, adequate documentation, and concurrent documentation.

Applicant nonprofit organizations should note that following receipt of an appropriate request, OJP may be authorized or required by law to make information submitted to satisfy this requirement available for public inspection. Also, a recipient may be required to make a prompt supplemental disclosure after the award in certain circumstances (e.g., changes in the way the organization determines compensation).

How To Apply

Applicants must register in and submit applications through [Grants.gov](https://www.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>.

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

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

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

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

Note on File Names and File Types: Grants.gov **only** permits the use of **certain specific** characters in the file names of attachments. Valid file names may include **only** the characters shown in the table below. Grants.gov rejects any application that includes an attachment(s) with a file name that contains **any** characters not shown in the table below. Grants.gov forwards successfully submitted applications to the OJP Grants Management System (GMS).

Characters
Upper case (A – Z)
Lower case (a – z)
Underscore (_)
Hyphen (-)
Space
Period (.)

Special Characters		
Parenthesis ()	Curly braces { }	Square brackets []
Ampersand (&)*	Tilde (~)	Exclamation point (!)
Comma (,)	Semicolon (;)	Apostrophe (')
At sign (@)	Number sign (#)	Dollar sign (\$)
Percent sign (%)	Plus sign (+)	Equal sign (=)

***When using the ampersand (&) in XML, applicants must use the “&” format.**

GMS does not accept executable file types as application attachments. These disallowed file types include, but are not limited to, the following extensions: “.com,” “.bat,” “.exe,” “.vbs,” “.cfg,” “.dat,” “.db,” “.dbf,” “.dll,” “.ini,” “.log,” “.ora,” “.sys,” and “.zip.” GMS may reject applications with files that use these extensions. It is important to allow time to change the type of file(s) if the application is rejected.

All applicants are required to complete the following steps:

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

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

If an applicant entity has not fully complied with the applicable SAM and unique identifier requirements by the time OJP makes award decisions, OJP may determine that the applicant is

not qualified to receive an award and may use that determination as a basis for making the award to a different applicant.

Applying as an Individual

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

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

Registration and Submission Steps

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

This unique entity identifier is used for tracking purposes, and to validate address and point of contact information for applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. It will be used throughout the life cycle of an OJP award. Obtaining a DUNS number is a free, one-time activity. Call Dun and Bradstreet at 866-705-5711 to obtain a DUNS number or apply online at <https://www.dnb.com/>. A DUNS number is usually received within 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 <https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants/registration.html>.

4. **Acquire confirmation for the AOR from the E-Business Point of Contact (E-Biz POC).** The E-Biz POC at the applicant organization must log into Grants.gov to confirm the applicant organization's AOR. The E-Biz POC will need the Marketing Partner Identification Number (MPIN) password obtained when registering with SAM to complete this step. Note that an organization can have more than one AOR.
5. **Search for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov.** Use the following identifying information when searching for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov. The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number for this solicitation is 16.828 titled "Swift, Certain, Fair (SCF) Sanctions Program: Replicating the Concepts Behind Project HOPE."
6. **Select the correct Competition ID.** Some OJP solicitations posted to Grants.gov contain multiple purpose areas, denoted by the individual Competition ID. If applying to a solicitation with multiple Competition IDs, select the appropriate Competition ID for the intended purpose area of the application:

Category 1: BJA-2018-13901

Category 2: BJA-2018-13902

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 14, 2018.

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

Note: Application Versions

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

Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues

An applicant that experiences unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond its control that prevent it from submitting its application by the deadline must contact the Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline at <https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/support.html> or the SAM Help Desk (Federal Service Desk) at <https://www.fsd.gov/fsd-gov/home.do> to report the technical issue and

receive a tracking number. The applicant must email the 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 email 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.

1. Description of the Issue (15 percent)

- Identify the Category of this solicitation, by number and name, under which the applicant is applying.
- Describe and demonstrate understanding of the nature and scope of the problem to be addressed, using data and research as support.
- Describe successful efforts to date to address the needs identified.
- Describe the need for assistance and resources to address the problem.
- Briefly introduce how the applicant proposes to address the problem.

2. Project Design and Implementation (40 percent)

- Address in detail how the applicant proposes to undertake and accomplish each of the objectives and deliverables outlined in the relevant Category (see pages 7–11).

- Applicants may propose other items or deliverables in addition to the ones listed under the specific Category for which they are applying, and should provide detailed information on those items.
- Inclusion of a timeline/project plan that identifies the major objectives and deliverables of the proposed project and who is responsible for each activity (see page 25) will contribute to scoring under this criterion.

3. Capabilities and Competencies (30 percent)

- Provide a detailed description of the capacity of the organization and the key personnel to deliver the required services and complete the key objectives described on pages 8–11.
- Describe how the proposed management structure and staffing of the project will facilitate the delivery of the required services. The management and organizational structure described should match the staffing needs necessary to accomplish the tasks outlined in the timeline/project plan.
- Information regarding the personnel assigned to these tasks included in the résumés and role descriptions (see page 25) will contribute to the assignment of points relative to this criterion.

4. Plan for Collecting the Data Required for this Solicitation’s Performance Measures (5 percent)

- Describe the manner in which the data required for this solicitation’s performance measures will be collected, including the system(s) used and the person(s) responsible.
- Describe whether and how other relevant performance metrics will be documented, monitored, and evaluated.

5. Budget (10 percent)

- Submit a budget that is complete, cost effective, and allowable (e.g., reasonable, allocable, and necessary for project activities).
- The budget narrative should demonstrate generally how the applicant will maximize cost effectiveness of grant expenditures. The budget narrative should demonstrate cost effectiveness in relation to potential alternatives and the objectives of the project.¹⁷

Review Process

OJP is committed to ensuring a fair and open process for making awards. BJA 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

¹⁷ Generally speaking, a reasonable cost is a cost that, in its nature or amount, does not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person under the circumstances prevailing at the time the decision was made to incur the costs.

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. BJA 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 BJA include geographic diversity, strategic priorities, and available funding, as well as 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 the applicant. 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 the 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 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.

Absent explicit statutory authorization or written delegation of authority to the contrary, all final award decisions will be made by the Assistant Attorney General, who may take into account not only peer review ratings and BJA 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 log in; execute a set of legal certifications and a set of legal assurances; designate a financial point of contact; thoroughly review the award, including all award conditions; and sign and accept the award. The award acceptance process requires physical signature of the award document by the authorized representative and the scanning and submission of the fully executed award document to OJP.

Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements

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

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

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

The webpages accessible through the “[Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2018 Awards](#)” are intended to give applicants for OJP awards a general overview of important statutes, regulations, and award conditions that apply to many (or in some cases, all) OJP grants and cooperative agreements awarded in FY 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, BJA expects that it will make any award under **Category 2** in the form of a cooperative agreement. Cooperative agreements include a condition in the award document that sets out the nature of the “substantial federal involvement” in carrying out the award and program. Generally stated, under OJP cooperative agreement awards, responsibility for the day-to-day conduct of the funded project rests with the recipient. OJP, however, may have substantial involvement in matters such as substantive coordination of technical efforts and site selection, as well as review and approval of project work plans, research designs, data collection instruments, and major project-generated materials. In addition, OJP often indicates in the award terms and conditions that it may redirect the project if necessary.

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

General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements

In addition to the deliverables 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. Future awards and fund drawdowns may be withheld if reports are delinquent. (In appropriate cases, OJP may require additional reports.)

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

Data on performance measures. In addition to required reports, each award recipient 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 in 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 as part of regular progress reporting. Successful applicants will be required to access OJP’s performance measurement page at ojp.gov/performance to view the specific reporting requirements for this grant program. Performance measures are also listed as [Appendix A](#).

G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)

For OJP contact(s), see the title page.

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

H. Other Information

Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552 and 5 U.S.C. 552a)

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

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

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

Provide Feedback to OJP

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

IMPORTANT: This email is for feedback and suggestions only. OJP does **not** reply 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 email listed on the front of this 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 email your résumé to ojppeerreview@l-secb.com. (Do not send your résumé 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.

Appendix A: Performance Measures

Category 1: Implementing and Testing the SCF Principles

Award recipients for Category 1 will be required to provide the relevant data by submitting quarterly performance metrics through BJA's online Performance Measurement Tool (PMT) located at <https://bjapmt.ojp.gov>. Applicants should examine the complete list of Performance Measures at https://bjapmt.ojp.gov/help/SCF_PerformanceMeasures.pdf.

Category 2: Swift, Certain, Fair Resource Center

Objectives	Performance Measure	Data Grantee Provides
Objective 1: Support the development, implementation, and sustainment of SCF-informed strategies to reduce crime and recidivism through training.	Number of Trainings conducted	Number of trainings (by type): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-person • Web-based • CD/DVD • Peer to Peer • Workshop
	Number of participants who attend the training	Number of individuals who: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attend the training (in-person) or started the training (web-based) • Completed the training • Completed an evaluation at the conclusion of the training • Completed an evaluation and rated the training as satisfactory or better • Completed the post-test with an improved score over their pre-test
	Percentage of participants who successfully completed the training	
	Percentage of participants who rated the training as satisfactory or better	
	Percentage of participants trained and subsequently demonstrated performance improvement	
	Percentage of scholarship recipients surveyed who reported that the training provided information that could be utilized in their jobs	

Objectives	Performance Measure	Data Grantee Provides
	Number of curricula developed	Number of training curricula: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed • Pilot tested • Revised after being pilot tested
	Number of curricula that were pilot tested	
	Percentage of curricula that were revised after pilot testing	
Objective 2: Support the development, implementation, and sustainment of SCF-informed strategies to reduce crime and recidivism through technical assistance.	Percentage of requesting agencies that rated services as satisfactory or better	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of onsite visits completed • Number of reports submitted to requesting agencies after onsite visits • Number of requesting agencies that completed an evaluation of services • Number of agencies that rated the services as satisfactory or better (in terms of timeliness and quality) • Number of follow-ups with requesting agencies completed 6 months after onsite visit • Number of agencies that were planning to implement at least one or more recommendations 6 months after the onsite visit
	Percentage of requesting agencies that were planning to implement one or more recommendations	
	Percentage of peer visitors who reported that the visit to the other agency was useful in providing information on policies or practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of peer-to-peer visits completed • Number of peer visitors who completed an evaluation • Number of peer visitors who reported that the visit was useful in providing information on policies or practices • Number of follow-ups with the requesting peer visitor completed 6 months after the peer-to-peer visit • Number of peer visitors who were planning to implement at least one or more recommendations 6 months after the onsite visit
	Percentage of peer visitors who were planning to implement one or more policies or practices 6 months after they were observed at the visited site	

Objectives	Performance Measure	Data Grantee Provides
	Percentage of requesting agencies of other onsite services that rated the services provided as satisfactory or better	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of other onsite services provided • Number of requesting agencies that completed an evaluation of other onsite services • Number of agencies that rated the services as satisfactory or better
Objective 3: Increase information provided to BJA and the criminal justice community about SCF-informed strategies to reduce crime and recidivism.	Number of conferences or advisory/focus groups held	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of conferences or advisory/focus groups held • Number of conference or advisory/focus group attendees who completed an evaluation • Number of conference or advisory/focus group attendees who rated the advisory/focus group as satisfactory or better
	Percentage of advisory/focus groups evaluated as satisfactory or better	
	Number of publications developed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of publications/resources developed
	Number of publications disseminated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of publications/resources disseminated
	Percent of websites developed and maintained	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of websites developed • Number of websites maintained • Number of visits to websites during the current reporting period • Number of visits to websites during the previous reporting period
	Percent of increase in the number of visits to websites	
	Percentage of information requests responded to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of information requests • Number of information requests responded to

**Appendix B:
Swift, Certain, and Fair Supervision Program
Resource Materials**

Anchorage PACE: Probation Accountability with Certain Enforcement:

www.ajc.state.ak.us/reports/pace2011.pdf

http://justice.uaa.alaska.edu/forum/28/2-3summerfall2011/c_pace.html

BJA Center for Research Partnerships and Program Evaluation (CRPPE)

<https://www.bja.gov/programs/crppe/>

CrimeSolutions.gov

<http://www.crimesolutions.gov/>

CrimeSolutions.gov: Hawaii Opportunity Probation with Enforcement (HOPE) page:

<http://www.crimesolutions.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?id=49>

Example of a Warning Hearing:

<http://www.nij.gov/topics/corrections/community/drug-offenders/documents/229023-appendix-2-example-warning-hearing.pdf>

Identifying and Working With a Research Partner:

Frequently Asked Questions and Answers

<http://www.psnmsu.com/documents/ResearchPartnerQ&A.pdf>

National Institute of Justice (NIJ) "Swift and Certain" sanctions web page:

<http://www.nij.gov/topics/corrections/community/drug-offenders/pages/hawaii-hope.aspx>

National Network for Safe Communities: Swift, Certain, and Fair web page:

<http://nnscommunities.org/our-work/strategy/swift-certain-fair>

NIJ Report: Managing Drug-Involved Offenders:

<https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/247315.pdf>

South Dakota's 24/7 Sobriety project:

www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research_briefs/2012/RAND_RB9692.pdf

http://www.rand.org/pubs/external_publications/EP51155.html

Swift, Certain, and Fair Resource Center:

<http://scfcenter.org/>

Appendix C
Possible Members of the SCF Supervision Team

Stakeholders who may be integral to the success of an SCF Supervision Program:

- Chief judge
- One main SCF judge, with a back-up SCF judge
- Community correction leadership and officers
- Court administrator and staff
- Prosecutor
- Public defender or defense attorneys
- Law enforcement
- Jail administrator

Roles and Responsibilities of Possible Members of the SCF Supervision Team	
Chief Judge	The chief justice should give a letter of consent to support the program in her or his state since the judge is integral to all aspects of program fidelity.
The SCF or HOPE Judge with a Backup SCF or HOPE Judge	The judge presiding over an SCF calendar is responsible for delivering warning hearings to SCF or HOPE probationers, setting the sanctions for missed appointments or positive drug tests in Motions to Modify hearings, and revoking probation, as well as determining rewards for compliance. The presiding judge will also communicate key components of the program to the probation officers, attorneys, and court staff on an ongoing basis. Thus, the judge has primary oversight of the program.
Parole and Probation Leadership and Officers	A key component of an SCF Program is parole and probation leadership and their officers. The parole or probation officer serves as the frontline monitor of program compliance and ensures the process for swift, certain, and fair sanction delivery.
Court Administrator and Staff	The court administrator's staff prepare for the warning hearings (often done en masse), Motions to Modify, and revocation hearings. The staff will facilitate adherence to the program and answer questions or provide guidance on SCF court processes.
Prosecutor	The prosecutor represents the interest of the state or county in all SCF proceedings, including warning hearings and probation modification hearings. It is essential that the prosecutor understands the philosophy of the SCF initiative and at least agrees to work within the SCF framework. The prosecutor should attend and be involved in team meetings.
Public Defender/Defense Attorneys	The public defender or defense attorney represents the interests of the probationer or parolee during an SCF proceeding. It is essential that the public defender or defense attorney understands the philosophy of the SCF initiative and at least agrees to work within the SCF framework. The public defender or defense attorney should attend and be involved in team meetings.
Law Enforcement	The sheriff's office or local police department will be responsible for taking offenders who fail drug testing into custody, and also

Roles and Responsibilities of Possible Members of the SCF Supervision Team	
	will serve arrest warrants for absconders. Bench warrants should be served within 2 to 3 days for SCF probationers and parolees.
Jail Administrator	The jail administrator's responsibility is to detain the probationer or parolee prior to modification hearings and ensure transport of the SCF probationers and parolees under the expedited hearing schedule.

Appendix D: Sample Program and Research Model

Innovative Responses to Behavior in the Community: Swift, Certain, and Fair Supervision

Action plans must include a program and research model showing how grantees will implement and evaluate the SCF principles. A program and research model demonstrates the causal relationships between objectives, activities, and results. This is a useful tool to visualize the purpose and scope of proposed activities, including the resources needed, expected outcomes, and plans to measure them. The objectives and inputs/resources may correspond to multiple activities, outputs, and outcomes.

To satisfy the action plan requirement, program and research models must contain the six types of information indicated below and should reflect all objectives and activities of the initiative. The following example is two rows of a model from a supervision-related initiative designed to increase supervision success rates and reduce the number of new crimes committed by supervisees.

Project Goals	Inputs/ Resources (Include existing and grant-funded)	Activities and Timeline	Outputs/ Process Measures	Short-Term Outcomes (Define length of time in response)	Long-Term Outcomes (Define length of time in response)
Implement risk and/or needs assessment tool	Train correctional staff (grant)	Integrate tool into intake process and reentry case planning (Begin March 2018)	Number of assessments completed	Administer risk and needs assessment tool for all participants upon intake (Within 6 months of implementation)	Develop all case plans based on needs identified through assessment (By year 2 of implementation)
Train reentry staff in evidence-based cognitive behavioral intervention (CBI)	.5 FTE supervision officer (grant) .5 FTE reentry staff (existing)	Train staff in Thinking for a Change (T4C) (Training in April 2018)	Number of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff trained; • Training courses completed by staff; • New case plans that incorporate CBI based on needs assessment 	Train all reentry staff in T4C	Provide T4C no later than 90 days before release to all participants who are identified as having the criminogenic need of criminal thinking/behavior

Appendix E: Application Checklist

Innovative Responses to Behavior in the Community: Swift, Certain, and Fair Supervision

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 31)
- Acquire or renew registration with SAM (see page 31)

To Register with Grants.gov:

- Acquire AOR and Grants.gov username/password (see page 31)
- Acquire AOR confirmation from the E-Biz POC (see page 31)

To Find Funding Opportunity:

- Search for the Funding Opportunity on Grants.gov (see page 32)
 - Select the correct Competition ID (see page 32)
- Access Funding Opportunity and Application Package (see page 32)
- Sign up for Grants.gov email [notifications](#) (optional) (see page 29)
- Read [Important Notice: Applying for Grants in Grants.gov](#)
- Read OJP policy and guidance on conference approval, planning, and reporting available at ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/PostawardRequirements/chapter3.10a.htm (see page 15)

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

- (1) application has been received,
- (2) application has either been successfully validated or rejected with errors (see page 32)

If No Grants.gov Receipt, and Validation or Error Notifications are Received:

- contact NCJRS regarding experiencing technical difficulties (see page 2)

Overview of Post-Award Legal Requirements:

- Review the "[Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2018 Awards](#)" in the OJP Funding Resource Center at <https://ojp.gov/funding/index.htm>.

Scope Requirement:

- The federal amount requested is within the allowable limits of:
 - Category 1: \$600,000
 - Category 2: \$865,000

Eligibility Requirement:

Category 1: Eligible applicants are states, units of local government, and federally recognized Indian tribal governments (as determined by the Secretary of the Interior).

Category 2: Eligible applicants are limited to national-scope private and nonprofit organizations (including tribal nonprofit or for-profit organizations) and colleges and universities, both public and private (including tribal institutions of higher education). All recipients and subrecipients (including any for-profit organization) must forgo any profit or management fee.

What an Application Should Include:

- _____ Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) (see page 17)
- _____ *Project Abstract (see page 17)
- _____ *Program Narrative (see page 18)
- _____ *Budget Detail Worksheet (see page 20)
- _____ *Budget Narrative (see page 20)
- _____ Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable) (see page 23)
- _____ Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable) (see page 23)
- _____ Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire (see page 24)
- _____ [Disclosure of Lobbying Activities \(SF-LLL\)](#) (see page 24)
- _____ Additional Attachments
 - _____ Timeline/Project Plan (see page 25)
 - _____ *Letter from the Research Partner (see page 24)
 - _____ *Letter from Lead Agency (if applicable) (Category 1 only, see page 24)
 - _____ Other Letters of Support (see page 25)
 - _____ Position Descriptions (Category 2 only, see page 25)
 - _____ Résumés for key personnel (Category 2 only, see page 25)
 - _____ Examples of work products (Category 2 only, see page 25)
- _____ Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications (see page 25)
- _____ Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity (see page 26)
- _____ Disclosure of Process related to Executive Compensation (see page 28)
- _____ Request and Justification for Employee Compensation; Waiver (if applicable) (see page 15)

*These elements are the basic minimum requirements for applications. Applications that do not include these elements shall neither proceed to peer review nor receive further consideration by BJA.