



The [U.S. Department of Justice](#) (DOJ), [Office of Justice Programs](#) (OJP), [Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention](#) (OJJDP) is seeking applications for funding under its fiscal year (FY) 2016 Assessing the Impact of Juvenile Justice Reforms Program. This program furthers the Department's mission by supporting research and evaluation to investigate the effectiveness and/or cost efficiency of juvenile justice system reforms. In particular, OJJDP is interested in measuring the impact of policy changes that have been enacted or implemented in states participating in OJJDP's Smart on Juvenile Justice Initiative and reforms in other states and local jurisdictions that are consistent with OJJDP's vision for juvenile justice in which a youth's contact with the system is rare, fair, and beneficial.

OJJDP FY 2016 Assessing the Impact of Juvenile Justice Reforms Program

Applications Due: May 23, 2016

Eligibility

States (including territories), units of local government, federally recognized tribal governments (as determined by the Secretary of the Interior), nonprofit and for-profit organizations (including tribal nonprofit or for-profit organizations), and institutions of higher education (including tribal institutions of higher education) are eligible. Recipient organizations must agree to forgo any profit or management fee. Foreign governments, foreign organizations, and foreign institutions of higher education are not eligible to apply.

This solicitation has two categories. Applicants may submit more than one unique application under this solicitation, but they may not submit the same application under both categories. Applicants must clearly indicate under which category they are applying in the project abstract.

- **Category 1:** Smart on Juvenile Justice Initiative State Policy Evaluations
- **Category 2:** State and Local Juvenile Justice Reform Policy Evaluations

OJJDP welcomes applications that involve two or more entities that will carry out the funded federal award activities; however, one eligible entity must be the applicant and the other(s) must be proposed as subrecipient(s). The applicant must be the entity with primary responsibility for conducting and leading the project. If successful, the applicant will be responsible for monitoring and appropriately managing any subrecipients or, as applicable, for administering any procurement subcontracts that would receive federal program funds from the applicant under the award. (Applicants should also review and consider the "Duplicate Applications" note under [How To Apply](#) in Section D. Application and Submission Information.)

OJJDP may elect to make awards for applications submitted under this solicitation in future fiscal years, dependent on, among other things, the merit of the applications and on the availability of appropriations.

Deadline

Applicants must register with Grants.gov prior to submitting an application. All applications are due to be submitted and in receipt of a successful validation message in Grants.gov by 11:59 p.m. eastern time (ET) on May 23, 2016.

All applicants are encouraged to read this [Important Notice: Applying for Grants in Grants.gov](#).

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

Contact Information

For technical assistance with submitting an application, contact the Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline at 800-518-4726 or 606-545-5035, or via e-mail to support@grants.gov. Hotline hours of operation are 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, except federal holidays.

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

For assistance with any other requirements of this solicitation, contact the Response Center by telephone at 800-851-3420 or TTY: 301-240-6310 (Hearing impaired only), by e-mail at grants@ncjrs.gov, or by [web chat](#). Response Center hours of operation are 10 a.m. to 6 p.m. ET, Monday through Friday, and 10 a.m. to 8 p.m. ET on the solicitation close date. Answers to frequently asked questions that may assist applicants are posted at www.ojjdp.gov/grants/solicitations/FY2016/FAQ/AssessingJJReformFAQ.pdf.

Grants.gov number assigned to this announcement: OJJDP-2016-8999

Release date: March 23, 2016

Contents

A. Program Description	4
Overview	4
Program-Specific Information	4
Goal, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products.....	5
B. Federal Award Information.....	9
Type of Award	9
Financial Management and System of Internal Controls	10
Budget Information	10
Cost Sharing or Match Requirement.....	11
Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver.....	11
Prior Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conference/Meeting/Training Costs	12
Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable).....	12
C. Eligibility Information.....	12
Limit on Number of Applications Submissions	12
D. Application and Submission Information	12
What an Application Should Include	12
How To Apply	25
E. Application Review Information.....	28
Selection Criteria	28
Review Process.....	30
F. Federal Award Administration Information	31
Federal Award Notices	31
Administrative, National Policy, and other Legal Requirements	31
General Information About Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements	33
G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)	33
H. Other Information.....	33
Provide Feedback to OJP	33
Application Checklist	35

OJJDP FY 2016 Assessing the Impact of Juvenile Justice Reforms Program (CFDA #16.540)

A. Program Description

Overview

The Assessing the Impact of Juvenile Justice Reforms Program will support rigorous research and evaluations to investigate the effectiveness and/or cost efficiencies of juvenile justice system reforms. In particular, OJJDP is interested in measuring the impact of policy changes that have been enacted or implemented in states participating in OJJDP's Smart on Juvenile Justice Initiative and reforms in other states and local jurisdictions that are consistent with OJJDP's vision of a juvenile justice system where youth contact is rare, fair, and beneficial. OJJDP will prioritize proposals to evaluate reforms and policies that aim to minimize formal juvenile justice system involvement and ensure that when necessary, system responses hold youth accountable in a manner that is fair, responsive to their individualized needs, and developmentally appropriate.

Authorizing Legislation: The Department of Justice Appropriations Act, 2016, Pub. L. No. 114-113; 129 Stat. 2242, 2310.

Program-Specific Information

Increasingly, states and localities are incorporating the lessons from research on adolescent development and the effects of intervention strategies into their reforms of juvenile justice policy and practice. Many jurisdictions have strengthened policies that keep lower risk justice-involved youth out of correctional facilities and in, or near, their homes and communities. Similarly, jurisdictions have limited or eliminated practices based solely on control and deterrence in favor of treatment and services that, when implemented as designed, can reduce reoffending and improve youth outcomes. Juvenile justice professionals are using, or are basing their decisionmaking on, empirically based tools that help match youth's risk to public safety and needs to more appropriate levels and lengths of supervision, treatment, and other services. Scientific advancements guide many of these reforms and underscore that juvenile justice systems must take into account the fundamental developmental differences between adolescents and adults that affect offending behavior. However, further research is needed to demonstrate that recent reform efforts achieve improved outcomes and can serve as models for other jurisdictions seeking to implement similar reforms.

The Committee on Assessing Juvenile Justice Reform of the National Research Council of the National Academies in its comprehensive report [*Reforming Juvenile Justice: A Developmental Approach*](#)¹ highlighted the importance of continuing to build the evidence base for effective policy and practice:

¹ National Research Council. 2013. *Reforming Juvenile Justice: A Developmental Approach*. Committee on Assessing Juvenile Justice Reform, R.J. Bonnie, R.L. Johnson, B.M. Chemers, and J.A. Schuck, Eds. Committee on Law and Justice, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

“The experiential evidence is impressive in reform jurisdictions, but there is still little systematic empirical evidence that the major policy initiatives described in this report have reduced delinquency and have done so at a reasonable cost. However, even in the absence of definitive evaluations of major reforms, the committee is convinced that the impressive body of research on adolescent development and the effects of juvenile justice interventions and programs is now sufficiently robust to provide a solid foundation for juvenile justice policy and for guiding policies and practices as knowledge continues to develop.” (pg. 321)

Consequently, OJJDP will seek rigorous research proposals to assess the effectiveness and/or cost efficiency of juvenile justice system reform efforts. In particular, OJJDP is interested in measuring the impact of policy changes that have been enacted or implemented in states participating in OJJDP’s Smart on Juvenile Justice Initiative and reforms in other states and local jurisdictions that are consistent with OJJDP’s vision for juvenile justice in which a youth’s contact with the system is rare, fair, and beneficial.

Goal, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products

The goal of this program is to assess the effectiveness and/or cost efficiency of juvenile justice system reforms. For the purposes of this solicitation, OJJDP defines the juvenile justice system broadly to include systems involving law enforcement, courts, community corrections, and corrections. Reform may constitute systemic policy or practice change(s) within a locality and/or state that impacts one or more segments of the juvenile justice system. OJJDP is interested in change(s) resulting from administrative or legislative action to impact youth and system-level outcomes. Outcomes of interest include, but are not limited to, measures of positive youth development (e.g., work, education, health), reoffending, public safety, and juvenile justice system costs and reinvestment.

OJJDP expects to make separate awards to support evaluations under Category 1 (Smart on Juvenile Justice Initiative State Policy Evaluations) and Category 2 (State and Local Juvenile Justice Reform Policy Evaluations). Applicants may submit more than one unique application under this solicitation, but they may not submit the same application under both categories. All evaluation applicants should document via letters of support or memoranda of understanding that they have a partnership with the jurisdiction(s) and relevant agencies for the acquisition of data required to support the evaluation.

Applicants may propose to assess the impact of a specific reform or policy in more than one site (.e.g, multiple sites within a jurisdiction or in multiple jurisdictions) under a single award. Applicants may also propose to assess the impact of multiple policies in one site under a single award.

Note that this solicitation is focused on system and jurisdiction-level reforms. OJJDP will not consider for funding proposals to support evaluations of individual program models.

Objectives. OJJDP will prioritize applications for funding with the greatest potential impact to juvenile justice reform that clearly demonstrate sound and feasible research and evaluation methods.

The applicant should demonstrate how adolescent developmental science across cognitive, social, emotional, and cultural domains guides the reform effort under investigation. The applicant should clearly describe each policy proposed for study (see Category 1 and

Category 2 below), its relevance for juvenile justice decisionmakers, and how the expected findings will fill a gap in the literature and inform other jurisdictions engaged in or considering reforms to their juvenile justice policies and practices.

Applicants must clearly indicate one or more central research question(s) and describe their evaluation plan, including a detailed explanation of why the research design is a scientifically valid and feasible approach and how it includes the most reasonable and rigorous methods available to study the reform. At a minimum, the proposed research design should address the following:

- The data sources and their availability and quality.
- Data collection tools and data collection and processing procedures, including the steps for accessing data (i.e., establishing data-sharing agreements), linking records from multiple datasets, and transforming administrative records into analytic files.
- Whether the study design will entail an outcome and impact evaluation and/or other research approaches.
- How the applicant will isolate and measure policy change(s).
- How the applicant will measure impact (i.e., effectiveness and/or cost efficiency) for the proposed research questions and why this is the best approach for establishing a link, if any, between a reform or policy and changes in outcomes.
- The outcomes to be measured (i.e., youth and system outcomes).
- The plan for identifying the study site(s), target population, and comparison group(s).
- The study timeframe before and after the reform or policy implementation.
- The privacy and human subjects' considerations.
- The statistical and data analyses anticipated.
- The anticipated limitations and barriers in the approach and project, with a focus on study design feasibility and data quality.

Applicants should address one or more of the policy/reform categories below:

Category 1: Smart on Juvenile Justice Initiative State Policy Evaluations. OJJDP actively supports the implementation of systemwide reforms to improve outcomes, eliminate disparities, and save money while holding youth accountable in a developmentally appropriate manner. OJJDP launched the Smart on Juvenile Justice initiative in 2014 as part of the Justice Department's Smart on Crime effort. In 2015, OJJDP expanded *Smart on Juvenile Justice: A Comprehensive Strategy to Juvenile Justice Reform* to South Dakota and West Virginia and provided ongoing support for the three original states (Georgia,

Hawaii, and Kentucky) that received funding in 2014.² Under Category 1, OJJDP will support applicants to conduct scientifically rigorous evaluations of policies enacted or implemented in states participating in the Smart on Juvenile Justice Initiative. Examples of policies currently being implemented include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Establishing or enhancing alternatives to formal court processing.
- Prohibiting juveniles charged or adjudicated for certain offenses from being held in detention and/or out-of-home placement.
- Limiting the total period of out-of-home placement.
- Eliminating minimum periods of out-of-home placement.
- Limiting the total period of formal probation supervision.
- Establishing or enhancing the use of graduated sanctions for supervision violations.
- Establishing or enhancing the use of incentives to encourage supervision compliance (e.g., earned early discharge).
- Requiring the use of empirically based and validated screening and assessment tools to inform decisionmaking.
- Requiring the use of dispositional matrices to inform recommendations.
- Requiring the development and use of case management and/or reentry plans for youth under supervision.
- Establishing or enhancing the use of research and evidence-based community programs, including community-based alternatives to detention and alternatives to placement.
- Establishing or enhancing family engagement practices.
- Establishing or enhancing fiscal incentive programs.

Category 2: State and Local Juvenile Justice Reform Policy Evaluations. Other states and localities have made (or are considering making) policy changes to reform their juvenile justice systems to produce better outcomes for youth, improve public safety, and achieve a greater return on taxpayer investments. Under Category 2, OJJDP will support applicants to conduct scientifically rigorous evaluations of policies enacted or implemented as a result of other state or local reform initiatives. For Category 2, OJJDP encourages applications that include, but are not limited to, the following areas of investigation:

- Evaluating reforms to juvenile justice system policies or practices that aim to reduce formal system involvement to assess their impact on youth outcomes, public safety,

² Office of Justice Programs, Office of Communications. 2015. OJJDP Expands Smart on Juvenile Justice Program to Two New States [Press release]. Retrieved from <http://ojp.gov/newsroom/pressreleases/2015/ojp11232015.pdf>

and/or justice system costs and/or reinvestment (e.g., policies related to civil citations, court diversion, community-based alternatives to residential placement, jurisdictional age boundaries, and transfers to criminal court).

- Evaluating efforts to minimize or reduce collateral penalties or barriers to the academic, social, and economic success that youth who contact the juvenile justice system face (e.g., policies related to sealing and expungement of juvenile records, school reenrollment, other educational and vocational opportunities).
- Evaluating reforms that aim to mitigate negative outcomes, such as stress and trauma that juvenile justice practices and conditions may produce (e.g., policies related to stop and frisk practices; the use of segregation, isolation, or restraints in juvenile facilities).

Deliverables. OJJDP will expect award recipients to deliver the following:

- A draft implementation plan with the application and a detailed evaluation plan within 6 months of the award period start date. OJJDP will review and approve the implementation plan with a timeline.
- Practitioner friendly overview documents highlighting the project's goals and objectives, as OJJDP requires. (Refer to OJJDP News @ a Glance and JuvJust publications for examples of the type of documents requested, www.ojdp.gov/enews/enews.html.)
- Practitioner friendly interim reports highlighting the project's progress and interim findings, as OJJDP requires.
- A detailed progress report to OJJDP every 6 months describing the status of the research, methodological and implementation issues, progress toward the project goals, and any other issues that are relevant to the study's completion.
- Electronic copies of (1) a final, technical report and abstract highlighting key findings suitable for publication in a refereed journal and, as OJJDP requires, (2) a final report, including an executive summary, documenting the project and its findings, suitable for a nontechnical audience, to be developed and disseminated at OJJDP's discretion.
- One or more scholarly products, to result from each award under this solicitation, taking the form of one or more published, peer-reviewed, scientific journal articles and/or, if appropriate, law review journal articles, book chapter(s), or book(s) in the academic press.

Evaluation research. If an application includes an evaluation research component (or consists entirely of evaluation research), and the primary purpose of this evaluation is to determine the effectiveness or impact of an intervention (e.g., program or practice), OJJDP expects the applicant to propose the use of random selection and assignment of participants (or other appropriate units of analysis) to experimental and control conditions, if feasible. Applicants that include such evaluation research in their applications but do not propose the use of randomization should explain clearly why randomization is not feasible and propose a strong quasi-experimental design that can address the risk of selection bias. Applications that propose meta-analysis of existing evaluation studies must establish clear inclusion criteria that favor and provide separate analysis of effect sizes for randomized and strong

quasi-experimental studies. OJJDP encourages applicants to review [evidence rating criteria](#) for further information on high-quality evaluation design elements.

Also, applicants that propose evaluation research should seriously consider including cost/benefit analysis. In cases where evaluations find that interventions have produced the intended benefit, cost/benefit analysis provides a valuable and practical information that aids decision making for justice practitioners and policymakers.

B. Federal Award Information

OJJDP expects to make as many as four awards under this program. Applicants may apply for awards of as much as \$500,000 for project periods of as long as 4 years. OJJDP anticipates the total amount of funds available for all awards under this program is \$1.5 million.

While applicants are permitted to submit more than one unique application under this solicitation; applicants may not submit the same application under both categories. Applicants must clearly indicate under which category they are applying in the project abstract. Applicants may propose to assess the impact of a specific reform or policy in more than one site under a single award. Applicants may also propose to assess the impact of multiple policies in one site under a single award. All evaluation applicants should document that they have a partnership with a jurisdiction(s) and relevant agencies for the acquisition of necessary data to support the evaluation.

Indirect costs are allowable and included within the total award.

To allow time for, among other things, any necessary post-award review, modification, and OJP clearance of the proposed budget, applicants should propose an award start date of October 1, 2016.

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 Award³

OJJDP expects to make all awards from this solicitation in the form of grants.

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

³ See *generally* 31 U.S.C. §§ 6301-6305 (defines and describes various forms of federal assistance relationships, including grants and cooperative agreements (a type of grant)).

Financial Management and System of Internal Controls

Award recipients and subrecipients (including any recipient or subrecipient funded in response to this solicitation that is a pass-through entity⁴) must, as described in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements set out at 2 C.F.R. 200.303:

- (a) Establish and maintain effective internal control over the federal award that provides reasonable assurance that the recipient (and any subrecipient) is managing the federal award in compliance with federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the federal award. These internal controls should be in compliance with guidance in “Standards for Internal Control in the Federal Government” issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and the “Internal Control Integrated Framework” issued by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (COSO).
- (b) Comply with federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the federal awards.
- (c) Evaluate and monitor the recipient’s (and any subrecipient’s) compliance with statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of federal awards.
- (d) Take prompt action when instances of noncompliance are identified, including noncompliance identified in audit findings.
- (e) Take reasonable measures to safeguard protected personally identifiable information and other information the federal awarding agency or pass-through entity designates as sensitive or the recipient (or any subrecipient) considers sensitive consistent with applicable federal, state, local, and tribal laws regarding privacy and obligations of confidentiality.

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

Budget Information

All budgeted funds under this solicitation must be for the direct support of research/evaluation related expenses.

OJJDP will not fund:

- Proposals that include support for the development of programs, program implementation, or delivery of direct services.
- Proposals primarily to purchase equipment, materials, or supplies. (A budget may include these items if they are necessary to conduct research, development, demonstration, evaluation, or analysis.)

⁴ For purposes of this solicitation (or program announcement), “pass-through entity” includes any entity eligible to receive funding as a recipient or subrecipient under this solicitation (or program announcement) that, if funded, may make a subaward(s) to a subrecipient(s) to carry out part of the funded program.

- Proposals that are not responsive to this specific solicitation.
- Pursuant to the [Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act](#), grantees may not use OJJDP funds for any biomedical or behavior control experimentation on individuals or any research involving such experimentation.

Cost Sharing or Match 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.

Preagreement Cost (also known as Preaward Cost) Approvals

Preagreement costs are costs incurred by the applicant prior to the start date of the period of performance of the grant award.

OJP does not typically approve preagreement costs; an applicant must request and obtain the prior written approval of OJP for all such costs. If approved, preagreement costs could be paid from grant funds consistent with a grantee's approved budget, and under applicable cost standards. However, all such costs prior to award and prior to approval of the costs are incurred at the sole risk of an applicant. Generally, no applicant should incur project costs *before* submitting an application requesting federal funding for those costs. Should there be extenuating circumstances that appear to be appropriate for OJP's consideration as preagreement costs, the applicant should contact the point of contact listed on the title page of this announcement for details on the requirements for submitting a written request for approval. See the section on Costs Requiring Prior Approval in the [Financial Guide](#), for more information.

Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver

With respect to any award of more than \$250,000 made under this solicitation, recipients may not use federal funds to pay total cash compensation (salary plus cash bonuses) to any employee of the award recipient at a rate that exceeds 110 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.⁵ The 2016 salary table for SES employees is available at the Office of Personnel Management [website](#). Note: A recipient may compensate an employee at a greater rate, provided the amount in excess of this compensation limitation is paid with nonfederal funds. (Any such additional compensation will not be considered matching funds where match requirements apply.) For employees who charge only a portion of their time to an award, the allowable amount to be charged is equal to the percentage of time worked times the maximum salary limitation.

The OJJDP Administrator may exercise discretion to waive, on an individual basis, the limitation on compensation rates allowable under an award. An applicant requesting a waiver should include a detailed justification in the budget narrative of the application. Unless applicants submit a waiver request and justification with their applications, they should anticipate that OJP will request that they adjust and resubmit the budget.

The justification should include the particular qualifications and expertise of the individual, the uniqueness of the service the individual will provide, the individual's specific knowledge

⁵ OJP does not apply this limitation on the use of award funds to the nonprofit organizations listed at Appendix VIII to 2 C.F.R. Part 200.

of the program or project being undertaken with award funds, and a statement explaining that the individual's salary is commensurate with the regular and customary rate for an individual with his/her qualifications and expertise, and for the work to be done.

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

OJP strongly encourages applicants that propose to use award funds for any conference-, meeting-, or training-related activity to review carefully—before submitting an application—the OJP [policy and guidance](#) on conference approval, planning, and reporting. OJP policy and guidance (1) encourage minimization of conference, meeting, and training costs; (2) require prior written approval (which may affect project timelines) of most conference, meeting, and training costs for cooperative agreement recipients and of some conference, meeting, and training costs for grant recipients; and (3) set cost limits, including a general prohibition of all food and beverage costs.

Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable)

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

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

C. Eligibility Information

For eligibility information, see the title page.

For additional information on cost sharing and match requirement, see Section [B. Federal Award Information](#).

Limit on Number of Applications Submissions

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

D. Application and Submission Information

What an Application Should Include

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

Moreover, applicants should anticipate that applications determined to be nonresponsive to the scope of the solicitation, or that do not include the application elements that OJJDP has designated to be critical, will neither proceed to peer review nor receive further consideration. Under this solicitation, OJJDP has designated the following application

elements as critical: Program Narrative, Budget Detail Worksheet, Budget Narrative, and *résumés/curriculum vitae* of key personnel. For purposes of this solicitation, “key personnel” means the principal investigator or project director, and any and all coprincipal investigators. Please review the “Note on File Names and File Types” under [How To Apply](#) to be sure applications are submitted in permitted formats.

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

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

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

Intergovernmental Review: This funding opportunity (program) **is not** subject to [Executive Order 12372](#). (In completing the SF-424, applicants are to make the appropriate selection in response to question 19 to indicate that the “Program is not covered by E.O. 12372.”)

Intergovernmental Review: This funding opportunity **is** subject to [Executive Order 12372](#). Applicants may find the names and addresses of their state’s Single Point of Contact (SPOC) at the following website: www.whitehouse.gov/omb/grants_spoc/. Applicants whose state appears on the SPOC list must contact their state’s SPOC to find out about, and comply with, the state’s process under Executive Order 12372. In completing the SF-424, applicants whose state appears on the SPOC list are to make the appropriate selection in response to question 19 once the applicant has complied with their state’s E.O. 12372 process. (Applicants whose state does not appear on the SPOC list are to make the appropriate selection in response to question 19 to indicate that the “Program is subject to E.O. 12372 but has not been selected by the State for review.”)

2. Project Abstract

The project abstract is a very important part of the application, and serves as an introduction to the proposed project. OJJDP uses the project abstract for a number of purposes, including assignment of the application to an appropriate review panel. If the application is funded, the project abstract typically will become public information and be used to describe the project.

The abstract must indicate whether this applicant is applying under Category 1 or Category 2.

Applications should include a high-quality project abstract that summarizes the proposed project in 250-400 words. Project abstracts should be—

- Written for a general public audience.

- Submitted as a separate attachment with “Project Abstract” as part of its file name.
- Single-spaced, using a standard 12-point font (Times New Roman) with 1-inch margins.

The abstract should include the category the application is being submitted under and a brief description of the following:

- The purpose of the project, the reform or policy to be evaluated, and the anticipated relevance to juvenile justice policy, practice, and theory.
- The study site(s), target population, and comparison group(s), including number of subjects and other relevant attributes.
- The study timeframe before and after the reform or policy implementation.
- The research design and methodology, including the type(s) of data, access and collection strategies, instruments, measurement considerations, and other methods or procedures. For an evaluation, clearly describe the type of evaluation (e.g., randomized control trial or quasi-experimental design).
- The techniques proposed for data analysis.
- The outcomes to be measured (i.e., short-term outcomes and/or long-term impacts).
- The expected deliverables, such as data sets, interim and final reports, and other dissemination plans.

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

All project abstracts should follow the [detailed template](#).

Permission to share project abstract with the public. It is unlikely that OJJDP will be able to fund all promising applications submitted under this solicitation, but it may have the opportunity to share information with the public regarding promising but unfunded applications, for example, through a listing on a webpage available to the public. The intent of this public posting would be to allow other possible funders to become aware of such proposals.

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

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

3. Program Narrative

Applicants must submit a program narrative that presents a detailed description of the purpose, goals, objectives, strategies, design, and management of the proposed program. The program narrative should be double-spaced with 1-inch margins, not exceeding 30 pages of 8½ by 11 inches, and use a standard 12-point font, preferably Times New Roman. Pages should be numbered “1 of 30,” etc. The tables, charts, pictures, etc., including all captions, legends, keys, subtext, etc., may be single-spaced and will count in the 30-page limit. Material required under the Budget and Budget Narrative and Additional Attachments sections will not count toward the program narrative page count. Applicants may provide bibliographical references as a separate attachment that will not count toward the 30-page program narrative limit. If the program narrative fails to comply with these length-related restrictions, OJJDP may consider such noncompliance in peer review and in final award decisions.

The program narrative should address the following selection criteria: (1) description of the policy and research questions; (2) project design and implementation; (3) potential impact; and (4) capabilities/ competencies. The applicant should clearly delineate the connections between and among each of these sections. For example, the project design section should clearly explain how the program’s structure and activities will respond to the policy and research questions identified in the previous section.

Program narrative guidelines:

- a. **Title page** (not counted against the 30-page program narrative limit) should include the title of the project, submission date, funding opportunity number, and the name and complete contact information (that is, address, telephone number, and e-mail address) for both the applicant organization and the principal investigator or project director).
- b. **Table of contents and figures** (not counted against the 30-page program narrative limit).
- c. **Main body** of the program narrative should describe the proposed project in depth. The following sections should be included as part of the program narrative:
 - (1) **Description of the policy and research questions.** Applicants should briefly describe the components of the reform or policy they will evaluate in keeping with the discussion on pages 5-8 (e.g., assessing the impact of juvenile justice reforms). The applicant should use data as evidence of the need to demonstrate the impact of the policy, explain the size and scope of the need, and document its importance to the target population and the larger community.

Applicants should discuss their research questions and how their proposed study addresses the research gaps they have identified.

Applicants should provide a brief review of the relevant theories and research supporting the proposed approach.

Applicants should describe any research or evaluation studies that relate to the reform or policy and contribute to the applicant's understanding of its effectiveness and/or cost efficiency. While OJJDP expects applicants to review the research literature for relevant studies, they should also explore whether unpublished local sources of research or evaluation data are available.

(2) Project design and implementation. Applicants should describe in detail the research design and methods they propose to achieve the goals listed on pages 5-8. This includes detailed explanations of:

- The data sources and their availability and quality.
- Data collection tools and data collection and processing procedures, including the steps for accessing data (i.e., establishing data-sharing agreements), linking records from multiple datasets, and transforming administrative records into analytic files.
- Whether this study design will entail an outcome and impact evaluation and/or other research approaches.
- How the applicant will isolate and measure policy change(s).
- How the applicant will measure impact (i.e., effectiveness and/or cost efficiency) for the proposed research questions and why this is the best approach for establishing a link, if any, between a reform or policy and changes in outcomes.
- The outcomes to be measured (i.e., youth and system outcomes).
- The plan for identifying the study site(s), target population, and comparison group(s).
- The study timeframe before and after the reform or policy implementation.
- The privacy and human subjects considerations.
- The statistical and data analyses anticipated.
- The anticipated limitations and barriers in the approach and project, with a focus on study design feasibility and data quality.

Logic model. Applicants should include a logic model that graphically illustrates the theory of change to be measured by the research/evaluation. Sample logic models are available [here](#). Applicants should submit the logic model as a separate attachment, as stipulated in Additional Attachments, page 22.

Timeline. Applicants should submit a realistic timeline or milestone chart that indicates major tasks associated with the goals and objectives of the project, assigns

responsibility for each, and plots completion of each task by month or quarter for the duration of the award, using “Year 1,” “Month 1,” “Quarter 1,” etc., not calendar dates (see “Sample Project Timelines” at www.ojjdp.gov/grantees/timelines.html).

Applicants should submit the timeline as a separate attachment, as stipulated in Additional Attachments, page 22.

- d. Potential impact.** Applicants should describe the potential impact of the project and how it may inform or improve juvenile justice-related policy, practice, and theory in the United States. This includes a description of the following:
- How study findings may inform or improve juvenile justice-related policy, practice, and reform efforts at the federal, state, and local levels.
 - How applicants will complete the deliverables stated in the Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables section on pages 5-8.
 - A plan for dissemination to broader audiences.
- e. Capabilities/competencies.** This section should describe the experience and capability of the applicant organization and any contractors or subgrantees that the applicant will use to implement and manage this effort and its associated federal funding, highlighting any previous experience implementing projects of similar scope, design, and magnitude.

Applicants should address:

- Experience and capacity to work with state and/or local government agencies on conducting policy evaluations.
- Experience and capacity to conduct a rigorous evaluation.
- Expertise in the field of juvenile justice reform.

Applicants are encouraged to subaward with organizations or individuals that have complementary skills and experiences for completing a project of this scope and size.

Applicants should also highlight their experience/capability/capacity to manage subawards, including details on their system for fiscal accountability. Management and staffing patterns should be clearly connected to the project design described in the previous section.

Applicants should describe the roles and responsibilities of project staff and explain the program’s organizational structure and operations. Applicants should include a copy of an organizational chart showing how the organization operates, including who manages the finances; how the organization manages subawards, if there are any; and the management of the project proposed for funding.

Applicants should address whether a technical workgroup will be included in the development and review of the research methodology.

- f. **Performance measures.** To demonstrate program progress and success, as well as, to assist the Department with fulfilling its responsibilities under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA), Public Law 103-62, and the GPRA Modernization Act of 2010, Public Law 111-352, applicants that receive funding under this solicitation must provide data that measure the results of their work done under this solicitation. OJP will require any award recipient, post award, to provide the data requested in the “Data Grantee Provides” column so that OJP can calculate values for the “Performance Measures” column. (Submission of performance measures data is not required for the application.) Performance measures for this solicitation are as follows:

Objective	Performance Measures	Description	Data Grantees Provides
To generate research/ evaluation to inform juvenile justice reform efforts.	Number of new policies, procedures, strategies, or interventions evaluated.	The number of policies, procedures, strategies, or interventions evaluated by type. Identify in the evaluation whether these are newly instituted during the reporting period or are existing policies, procedures, strategies, or interventions that have not previously been evaluated.	Number of new policies, procedures, strategies, or interventions evaluated.
	Number of gaps identified as a result of research.	The number of gaps identified as a result of research which would further information about evidence-based practices.	Number of gaps identified.
	Number of documents published.	Documents published may include peer-reviewed, scientific journal articles, and/or (if appropriate) law review journal articles, book chapter(s) or book(s) in the academic press.	Number of documents published.

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

- Bibliography/references.
- Any tools/instruments, questionnaires, tables/charts/graphs, or maps pertaining to the proposed project that are supplemental to such items included in the main body of the narrative.
- *Curriculum vitae* or résumés of the principal investigator and any and all co-principal investigators. In addition, *curriculum vitae*, résumés, or biographical sketches of all other individuals (regardless of investigator status) who will be

significantly involved in substantive aspects of the proposal (including, for example, individuals, such as statisticians serving as consultants to conduct proposed data analysis).

- List (to the extent known) of all proposed project staff members, including those affiliated with the applicant organization or any proposed subrecipient organization(s), any proposed consultant(s) and contractors (whether individuals or organizations), and any proposed members of an advisory board for the project (if applicable). The list should include, for each individual and organization: name, title (if applicable), employer or other organizational affiliation, and roles and responsibilities proposed for the project. Applicants should use the “Proposed Project Staff, Affiliation, and Roles” [form](#) to provide this listing.
- Proposed project timeline and expected milestones.
- List of any previous and current OJJDP awards to applicant organization and investigator(s), including the OJJDP-assigned award numbers and a brief description of any scholarly products that resulted in whole or in part from work funded under the OJJDP award(s). (See “Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products” under “Program-Specific Information,” above, for definition of “scholarly products.”)
- Letters of cooperation/support or memoranda of administrative agreements from organizations collaborating in the project, such as law enforcement, courts, and correctional agencies (if applicable).
- Data archiving plan. Applicants should anticipate that OJJDP will require (through special award conditions) that they submit data sets resulting in whole or in part from projects funded under this solicitation for archiving with the [National Archive of Criminal Justice Data](#).

Applicants should include a brief statement (less than one page) labeled “Data Archiving Plan” that documents how they will comply with OJJDP data archiving requirements. Grantees must work with OJJDP and/or its designee (e.g., National Archive of Criminal Justice Data) to develop a plan to archive the research data for public use, with a specific schedule, tasks, and milestones. The plan will be due to OJJDP as part of the implementation plan within 6 months of the project period start date. See the [Guide to Social Science Data Preparation and Archiving](#) for information about what is included in a data archiving plan.

- Letters of Support/memoranda of understanding. If submitting an application with a subaward, as described under Eligibility, page 1, applicants should provide signed and dated letters of support or memoranda of understanding for all key partners that include the following:
 - Expression of support for the program and a statement of willingness to participate and collaborate with it.

- Description of the partner's current role and responsibilities in the planning process and expected responsibilities when the program is operational.
- Estimate of the percent of time that the partner will devote to the planning and operation of the project.

Letters of support may be addressed to OJJDP Administrator Robert L. Listenbee. During the review process, OJJDP will consider only letters of support that are submitted by the due date and with the full application.

4. Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative

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

For questions pertaining to budget and examples of allowable and unallowable costs, see the [Financial Guide](#).

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

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

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

- c. **Noncompetitive Procurement Contracts In Excess of Simplified Acquisition Threshold.** If an applicant proposes to make one or more noncompetitive procurements of products or services, where the noncompetitive procurement will exceed the simplified acquisition threshold (also known as the small purchase threshold), which is currently set at \$150,000, the application should address the considerations outlined in the [Financial Guide](#).

d. Preagreement Cost Approvals. For information on preagreement costs approvals, see Section [B. Federal Award Information](#).

5. Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable)

Indirect costs are allowed only under the following circumstances:

- a.** The applicant has a current, federally approved indirect cost rate; or
- b.** The applicant is eligible to use and elects to use the *de minimis* indirect cost rate described in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements as set out at 2 C.F.R. 200.414(f).

Attach a copy of the federally approved indirect cost rate agreement to the application. Applicants that do not have an approved rate may request one through their cognizant federal agency, which will review all documentation and approve a rate for the applicant organization, or, if the applicant's accounting system permits, costs may be allocated in the direct cost categories. For the definition of Cognizant Federal Agency, see the "Glossary of Terms" in the [Financial Guide](#). For assistance with identifying your cognizant agency, contact the Customer Service Center at 1-800-458-0786 or at ask.ocfo@usdoj.gov. If DOJ is the cognizant federal agency, applicants may obtain information needed to submit an indirect cost rate proposal at <http://www.ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/IndirectCosts.pdf>.

In order to use the "de minimis" indirect rate, attach written documentation to the application that advises OJP of both the applicant's eligibility (to use the "de minimis" rate) and its election. If the applicant elects the "de minimis" method, costs must be consistently charged as either indirect or direct costs, but may not be double charged or inconsistently charged as both. In addition, if this method is chosen then it must be used consistently for all federal awards until such time as you choose to negotiate a federally approved indirect cost rate.⁶

6. Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable)

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

Applicants unable to submit an application that includes a fully executed (i.e., signed) copy of appropriate legal documentation, as described above, consistent with the applicable tribe's governance structure, should submit, at a minimum, an unsigned, draft version of such legal documentation as part of its application (except for cases in which,

⁶ See 2 C.F.R. § 200.414(f).

with respect to a tribal consortium applicant, consortium bylaws allow action without the support of all consortium member tribes). If selected for funding, OJJDP will make use of and access to funds contingent on receipt of the fully executed legal documentation.

7. Applicant Disclosure of High Risk Status

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

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

OJP seeks this information to ensure appropriate federal oversight of any grant award. Disclosing this high risk information does not disqualify any organization from receiving an OJP award. However, additional grant oversight may be included, if necessary, in award documentation.

8. Additional Attachments

- a. Applicant disclosure of pending applications.**⁷ Applicants are to disclose whether they have pending applications for federally funded grants or subgrants (including cooperative agreements) that include requests for funding to support the same project being proposed under this solicitation and will cover the identical cost items outlined in the budget narrative and worksheet in the application under this solicitation. The disclosure should include both direct applications for federal funding (e.g., applications to federal agencies) and indirect applications for such funding (e.g., applications to state agencies that will subaward federal funds).

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

Applicants that have pending applications as described above are to provide the following information about pending applications submitted within the last 12 months:

- The federal or state funding agency.

⁷ Typically, the applicant is not the principal investigator; rather, the applicant, most frequently, is the institution, organization, or company in which the principal investigator is employed.

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

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

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

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

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

OR

- b. A specific listing of actual or perceived conflicts of interest that the applicant has identified in relation to this proposal. These conflicts could be either personal (related to specific staff, consultants, and/or subrecipients) or organizational (related to the applicant or any subgrantee organization).

Examples of potential investigator (or other personal) conflict situations may include, but are not limited to, those in which an investigator would be in a position to evaluate a spouse's work product (actual conflict), or an investigator would be in a position to evaluate the work of a former or current colleague (potential apparent conflict). With regard to potential organizational conflicts of interest, as one example, generally an organization could not be given a grant to evaluate a project if that organization had itself provided substantial prior technical assistance to that specific project or a location implementing the project (whether funded by OJP or other sources), as the organization in such an instance would appear to be evaluating the effectiveness of its own prior work. The key is whether a reasonable person understanding all of the facts would be able to have confidence that the results of any research or evaluation project are objective and reliable. Any outside personal or financial interest that casts doubt on that objectivity and reliability of an evaluation or research product is a problem and must be disclosed.

- ii. In addition, for purposes of this solicitation applicants must address the issue of possible mitigation of research integrity concerns by including, at a minimum, one of the following two items:
 - a. If an applicant reasonably believes that no potential personal or organizational conflicts of interest exist, then the applicant should provide a brief narrative explanation of how and why it reached that conclusion. Applicants **MUST** also include an explanation of the specific processes and procedures that the applicant will put in place to identify and eliminate (or, at the very least, mitigate) potential personal or financial conflicts of interest on the part of its staff, consultants, and/or subrecipients for this particular project, should that be necessary during the grant period. Documentation that may be helpful in this regard could include organizational codes of ethics/conduct or policies regarding organizational, personal, and financial conflicts of interest.

OR

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

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

adequacy of the applicant's existing or proposed remedies to control any such factors.

9. Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire

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

10. Disclosure of Lobbying Activities

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

How To Apply

Applicants must register in, and submit applications through Grants.gov, a primary source to find federal funding opportunities and apply for funding. Find complete instructions on how to register and submit an application at [www.Grants.gov](#). Applicants that experience technical difficulties during this process should call the Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline at **800-518-4726** or **606-545-5035**, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, except federal holidays. Registering with Grants.gov is a one-time process; however, **processing delays may occur, and it can take several weeks** for first-time registrants to receive confirmation and a user password. OJP encourages applicants to **register several weeks before** the application submission deadline. In addition, OJP urges applicants to submit applications 72 hours prior to the application due date to allow time to receive validation messages or rejection notifications from Grants.gov, and to correct in a timely fashion any problems that may have caused a rejection notification.

OJJDP strongly encourages all prospective applicants to sign up for Grants.gov email [notifications](#) regarding this solicitation. If this solicitation is cancelled or modified, individuals who sign up with Grants.gov for updates will be automatically notified.

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

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

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

Characters	Special Characters		
Upper case (A – Z)	Parenthesis ()	Curly braces { }	Square brackets []
Lower case (a – z)	Ampersand (&)	Tilde (~)	Exclamation point (!)
Underscore (_)	Comma (,)	Semicolon (;)	Apostrophe (')
Hyphen (-)	At sign (@)	Number sign (#)	Dollar sign (\$)
Space	Percent sign (%)	Plus sign (+)	Equal sign (=)
Period (.)	When using the ampersand (&) in XML, applicants must use the “&#amp;” format.		

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

All applicants are required to complete the following steps:

OJP may not make a federal award to an applicant organization until the organization has complied with all applicable DUNS and SAM requirements. If an applicant has not fully complied with the requirements by the time the federal awarding agency is ready to make a federal award, the federal awarding agency may determine that the applicant is not qualified to receive a federal award and use that determination as a basis for making a federal award to another applicant.

- 1. Acquire a Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number.** In general, the Office of Management and Budget requires that all applicants (other than individuals) for federal funds include a DUNS number in their applications for a new award or a supplement to an existing award. A DUNS number is a unique nine-digit sequence recognized as the universal standard for identifying and differentiating entities receiving federal funds. The identifier is used for tracking purposes and to validate address and point of contact information for federal assistance applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. The DUNS number will be used throughout the grant life cycle. Obtaining a DUNS number is a free, one-time activity. Call Dun and Bradstreet at 866-705-5711 to obtain a DUNS number or apply online at www.dnb.com. A DUNS number is usually received within 1-2 business days.
- 2. Acquire registration with the System for Award Management (SAM).** SAM is the repository for standard information about federal financial assistance applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. OJP requires all applicants (other than individuals) for federal financial assistance to maintain current registrations in the SAM database. Applicants must be registered in SAM to successfully register in Grants.gov. Applicants must **update or renew their SAM registration annually** to maintain an active status. SAM registration and renewal can take as long as 10 business days to complete.

Applications cannot be successfully submitted in Grants.gov until Grants.gov receives the SAM registration information. The information transfer from SAM to Grants.gov can take up to 48 hours. OJP recommends that the applicant register or renew registration with SAM as early as possible.

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

3. **Acquire an Authorized Organization Representative (AOR) and a Grants.gov username and password.** Complete the AOR profile on Grants.gov and create a username and password. The applicant organization's DUNS number must be used to complete this step. For more information about the registration process, go to www.grants.gov/web/grants/register.html.
4. **Acquire confirmation for the AOR from the E-Business Point of Contact (E-Biz POC).** The E-Biz POC at the applicant organization must log into Grants.gov to confirm the applicant organization's AOR. The E-Biz POC will need the Marketing Partner Identification Number (MPIN) password obtained when registering with SAM to complete this step. Note that an organization can have more than one AOR.
5. **Search for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov.** Use the following identifying information when searching for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov. The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance number for this solicitation is 16.540, titled "Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Allocation to States" and the funding opportunity number is OJJDP-2016-8999.
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. Smart on Juvenile Justice Initiative State Policy Evaluations. Competition ID OJJDP-2016-9115.

Category 2: State and Local Juvenile Justice Reform Policy Evaluations. Competition ID OJJDP-2016-9116.

7. **Submit a valid application consistent with this solicitation by following the directions in Grants.gov.** Within 24–48 hours after submitting the electronic application, the applicant should receive two notifications from Grants.gov. The first will confirm the receipt of the application and the second will state whether the application has been successfully validated, or rejected due to errors, with an explanation. It is possible to first receive a message indicating that the application is received and then receive a rejection notice a few minutes or hours later. Submitting well ahead of the deadline provides time to correct the problem(s) that caused the rejection. **Important:** OJP urges applicants to submit applications **at least 72 hours prior** to the application due date to allow time to receive validation messages or rejection notifications from Grants.gov, and to correct in a timely fashion any problems that may have caused a rejection notification. Applicants must submit their applications and have received a validation message in Grants.gov by 11:59 p.m. ET on May 23, 2016.

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

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

Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues

Applicants that experience unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond their control that prevent them from submitting their application by the deadline must contact the [Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline](#) or the [SAM Help Desk](#) (Federal Service Desk) to report the technical issue and receive a tracking number. The applicant must e-mail the Response Center at grants@ncjrs.gov **within 24 hours after the application deadline** and request approval to submit their application. The e-mail must describe the technical difficulties, and include a timeline of the applicant's submission efforts, the complete grant application, the applicant's DUNS number, and any Grants.gov Help Desk or SAM tracking number(s).

Note: OJJDP does not automatically approve requests. After the program office reviews the submission, and contacts the Grants.gov or SAM Help Desks to validate the reported technical issues, OJP will inform the applicant whether the request to submit a late application has been approved or denied. If OJP determines that the applicant failed to follow all required procedures, which resulted in an untimely application submission, OJP will deny the applicant's request to submit their application.

The following conditions are generally insufficient to justify late submissions:

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

Notifications regarding known technical problems with Grants.gov, if any, are posted at the top of the OJP funding [webpage](#).

E. Application Review Information

Selection Criteria

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

Description of the Policy and Research Questions (Understanding of the problem, the objectives, and their importance) – 15 percent

1. Demonstrated understanding of the components of the reform or policy being evaluated.
2. Demonstrated awareness of the state of current research.

Project Design and Implementation (Quality and technical merit) – 45 percent

1. Soundness of methods and analytic and technical approach to addressing the stated aim(s) of the proposed project.
2. Feasibility of the proposed project.
3. Awareness of potential pitfalls of proposed project design and feasibility of proposed actions to minimize and/or mitigate them.
4. Likelihood of proposed approach to address the key objectives outlined under the Program Specific Information, Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables.

Potential Impact – 20 percent

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

1. Potential for significantly improved understanding of the effectiveness and/or cost efficiency of a juvenile justice reform or policy.
2. Potential to apply (all or a significant part of) the study results to enhance juvenile justice policy or practice at the federal, state, and local levels.

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

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

Budget

Peer reviewers will consider and may comment on the following additional items in the context of scientific and technical merit.

1. Total cost of the project relative to the perceived benefit (cost effectiveness).
2. Appropriateness of the budget relative to the level of effort.
3. Use of existing resources to conserve costs.
4. Proposed budget alignment with proposed project activities.

Review Process

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

Peer reviewers will review the applications submitted under this solicitation that meet basic minimum requirements. For purposes of assessing whether applicants have met basic minimum requirements, OJP screens applications for compliance with specified program requirements to help determine which applications should proceed to further consideration for award. Although program requirements may vary, the following are common requirements applicable to all solicitations for funding under OJP grant programs:

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

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

OJJDP may use internal peer reviewers, external peer reviewers, or a combination, to assess applications meeting basic minimum requirements on technical merit using the solicitation’s selection criteria. An external peer reviewer is an expert in the subject matter of a given solicitation who is not a current DOJ employee. An internal reviewer is a current DOJ employee who is well-versed or has expertise in the subject matter of this solicitation. A peer review panel will evaluate, score, and rate applications that meet basic minimum requirements.

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

1. Financial stability and fiscal integrity.
2. Quality of management systems and ability to meet the management standards prescribed in the [Financial Guide](#).
3. History of performance.
4. Reports and findings from audits.
5. The applicant's ability to effectively implement statutory, regulatory, or other requirements imposed on award recipients.

6. Proposed costs to determine if the Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative accurately explain project costs, and whether those costs are reasonable, necessary, and allowable under applicable federal cost principles and agency regulations.

The OJJDP Administrator will make all final award decisions. Peer reviewers' ratings and any resulting recommendations are advisory only, although their views are considered carefully. In addition to peer review ratings, considerations for award recommendations and decisions may include, but are not limited to, planned scholarly products, proposed budgets, past performance (including scholarly products) under prior OJJDP and OJP awards, research independence and integrity, strategic priorities, and available funding when making awards.

F. Federal Award Administration Information

Federal Award Notices

OJP sends award notification by email through GMS to the individuals listed in the application as the point of contact and the authorizing official (E-Biz POC and AOR). The email notification includes detailed instructions on how to access and view the award documents, and how to accept the award in GMS. GMS automatically issues the notifications at 9:00 p.m. eastern time on the award date (by September 30, 2016). Recipients will be required to login; accept any outstanding assurances and certifications on the award; designate a financial point of contact; and review, sign, and accept the award. The award acceptance process involves physical signature of the award document by the authorized representative and the scanning of the fully-executed award document to OJP.

Administrative, National Policy, and other Legal Requirements

If selected for funding, in addition to implementing the funded project consistent with the agency-approved project proposal and budget, the recipient must comply with award terms and conditions, and other legal requirements, that are included in the award, incorporated into the award by reference, or are otherwise applicable to the award. OJP strongly encourages prospective applicants to review the information pertaining to these requirements **prior** to submitting an application. To assist applicants and recipients in accessing and reviewing this information, OJP has placed it on its [Solicitation Requirements](#) page of the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#).

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

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

Upon grant approval, OJP electronically transmits (via GMS) the award document to the prospective award recipient. In addition to other award information, the award document

contains award terms and conditions that specify national policy requirements⁸ with which recipients of federal funding must comply; uniform administrative requirements, cost principles, and audit requirements; and program-specific terms and conditions required based on applicable program (statutory) authority or requirements set forth in OJP solicitations and program announcements. For example, certain efforts may call for special requirements, terms, or conditions relating to intellectual property, data/information-sharing or -access, or information security; or audit requirements, expenditures and milestones, or publications and/or press releases.

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

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

Human Subjects and Privacy Certificate

DOJ regulations (28 C.F.R. Part 46) protect the human subjects of federally funded research. Part 46 requires that an Institutional Review Board, in accordance with the regulations, review and approve most research involving human subjects that any federal department or agency conducts or supports before an award recipient may expend federal funds for that research. As a rule, persons who participate in federally funded research must provide their informed consent and must be permitted to terminate their participation at any time. Funding recipients, before they will be allowed to spend OJP funds on any research activity involving human subjects, must submit appropriate documentation to OJP showing compliance with 28 C.F.R. Part 46 requirements, as requested by OJP.

DOJ regulations (28 C.F.R. Part 22) require recipients of OJP funding to submit a Privacy Certificate as a condition of approval of any grant application or contract proposal that contains a research or statistical component under which "information identifiable to a private person" will be collected, analyzed, used, or disclosed. The funding recipient's Privacy Certificate includes a description of its policies and procedures to be followed to protect the confidentiality of identifiable data (28 C.F.R. § 22.23). The Department's regulations provide, among other matters, that: "Research or statistical information identifiable to a private person may be used only for research or statistical purposes (28 C.F.R. § 22.21)." Moreover, any private person from whom information identifiable to a private person is collected or obtained (either orally or by means of written questionnaire or other document) must be advised that the information will only be used or disclosed for research or statistical purposes and that compliance with the request for information is voluntary and may be terminated at any time (28 C.F.R. § 22.27).

Applicants selected for an award will be required to submit all appropriate IRB and privacy documents prior to spending OJP funds for research-related activities.

⁸ See generally 2 C.F.R. 200.300 (provides a general description of national policy requirements typically applicable to recipients of Federal awards, including the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (FFATA)).

General Information About Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements

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

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

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

Draft and Final Summary Overview of the Work Conducted under the Award

A final, detailed report documenting the project design, implementation, evaluation, and its findings. This publication should include an executive summary and be suitable for a non-technical audience, to be disseminated at OJJDP’s discretion.

Required Data Sets and Associated Files and Documentation

As discussed earlier, OJJDP requires recipients of an award under this solicitation to submit to NACJD all data sets that result in whole or in part from the work funded by OJJDP, along with associated files and any documentation necessary to allow for future efforts by others to reproduce the project’s findings and/or to extend the scientific value of the data set through secondary analysis. All data sets and necessary documentation are to be submitted 90 days prior to the end of the project period. For more information, see the “Program Narrative” section of What an Application Should Include.

G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)

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

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

H. Other Information

Provide Feedback to OJP

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

IMPORTANT: This e-mail is for feedback and suggestions only. Replies are not sent from

this mailbox. If you have specific questions on any program or technical aspect of the solicitation, you must directly contact the appropriate number or e-mail listed on the front of this solicitation document. These contacts are provided to help ensure that you can directly reach an individual who can address your specific questions in a timely manner.

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

Application Checklist

OJJDP FY 2016 Assessing the Impact of Juvenile Justice Reforms Program

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

What an Applicant Should Do:

Prior to Registering in Grants.gov:

_____ Acquire a DUNS Number (see page 26)

_____ Acquire or renew registration with SAM (see page 26)

To Register with Grants.gov:

_____ Acquire AOR and Grants.gov username/password (see page 27)

_____ Acquire AOR confirmation from the E-Biz POC (see page 27)

To Find Funding Opportunity:

_____ Search for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov (see page 27)

_____ Select the correct Competition ID (see page 27)

_____ Download Funding Opportunity and Application Package

_____ Sign up for Grants.gov email [notifications](#) (optional) (see page 25)

_____ Read [Important Notice: Applying for Grants in Grants.gov](#)

_____ Read [OJP policy and guidance](#) on conference approval, planning, and reporting (see page 12)

After application submission, receive Grants.gov email notifications that:

_____ (1) application has been received

_____ (2) application has either been validated or rejected (see page 27)

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

_____ contact the Response Center at grants@ncjrs.gov regarding technical difficulties. Refer to the section: Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues (see page 28)

General Requirements:

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

Scope Requirement:

_____ The federal amount requested is within the allowable limit(s) of \$500,000.

Eligibility Requirement:

_____ State, territory, unit of local government, or federally recognized tribal government.

_____ Nonprofit or for-profit organization, including tribal nonprofit or for-profit organization.

_____ Institution of higher education, including tribal institution of higher education.

_____ Qualified individual.

_____ Foreign governments, foreign organizations, and foreign institutions of higher education are not eligible to apply.

What an Application Should Include:

- _____ Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) (see page 13)
- _____ Project Abstract (see page 13)
- _____ Program Narrative (see page 14)
- _____ Appendices (see page 18)
- _____ Budget Detail Worksheet and Narrative (see page 20)
- _____ Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (see page 21)
- _____ Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable) (see page 21)
- _____ Applicant Disclosure of High Risk Status (see page 22)
- _____ Additional Attachments
 - _____ Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications
 - _____ Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity
 - _____ logic model
 - _____ timeline or milestone chart
 - _____ résumés of all key personnel
 - _____ job descriptions outlining roles and responsibilities for all key positions
 - _____ letters of support/memoranda of understanding from partner organizations
 - _____ evidence of nonprofit status, e.g., a copy of the tax exemption letter from the Internal Revenue Service, if applicable.
 - _____ evidence of for-profit status, e.g., a copy of the articles of incorporation, if applicable.
- _____ Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire (see page 25)
- _____ [Disclosure of Lobbying Activities \(SF-LLL\)](#) (see page 25)
- _____ Employee Compensation Waiver request and justification (if applicable) (see page 11)