



The Department of Justice, through its components the [Office of Justice Programs \(OJP\)](#), the [Community Oriented Policing Services Office \(COPS\)](#), the [Office on Violence against Women \(OVW\)](#), and the [Community Relations Service \(CRS\)](#), is seeking applications for funding under this National Center for Building Community Trust and Justice grant announcement. The purpose of this initiative is to enhance procedural justice, reduce bias, and support racial reconciliation. This initiative furthers the Department's mission to ensure public safety and to ensure fair and impartial administration of justice for all Americans.

National Center for Building Community Trust and Justice: Improving the Justice System by Enhancing Procedural Justice, Reducing Bias, and Supporting Racial Reconciliation

FY 2014 Competitive Grant Announcement

Eligibility

Eligible applicants are limited to national, regional, state, or local public and private entities, including non-profit organizations (including tribal nonprofit organizations), faith-based and community organizations, institutions of higher education (including tribal institutions of higher education), and units of local government.

DOJ encourages applications that involve two or more entities, 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 administering the funding and managing the entire project. Only one application per lead applicant will be considered; however, subrecipients may be part of multiple proposals.

Deadline

Applicants must register with [Grants.gov](#) prior to submitting an application. (See "How to Apply," page xx.) All applications are due by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on June 18, 2014. (See "Deadlines: Registration and Application," page 6.)

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

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. The Grants.gov Support Hotline hours of operation are 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, except federal holidays.

Applicants that experience unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond their control that prevent them from submitting their application by the deadline must e-mail the DOJ contact identified below **within 24 hours after the application deadline** and request approval to submit their application.

For assistance with any other requirements of this solicitation, contact the Office of Justice Programs at NCBCTJSolicitation@usdoj.gov.

DOJ will hold a “pre-application conference call” on Wednesday, May 7, from 1:00-2:00 p.m. ET. The purpose of this call is for federal staff to respond to substantive questions about the solicitation requirements in order to assist applicants, or entities considering applying, in formulating their applications. Applicants must register to participate in the bidders’ call by e-mailing NCBCTJSolicitation@usdoj.gov on or before 5:00 p.m. on Monday, May 5 to express their intention to participate in the call. The call in number and passcode will be distributed via e-mail.

Grants.gov number assigned to this announcement: DOJ-2014-3797

Release date: Original April 4, 2014
Updated April 15, 2014
Updated April 30, 2014
Updated May 29, 2014

Contents

Overview.....	4
Deadlines: Registration and Application	7
Eligibility.....	7
National Center for Building Community Trust and Justice —Specific Information.....	8
Background	8
Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables	13
Performance Measures	23
What an Application Should Include	25
1. Information to Complete the Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424)....	25
2. Project Abstract.....	26
3. Program Narrative.....	26
4. Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative	27
5. Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable)	28
6. Additional Attachments	29
7. Accounting System and Financial Capability Questionnaire	31
Selection Criteria	31
Review Process	32
Additional Requirements.....	33
How to Apply	34
Provide Feedback to OJP	37
Application Checklist.....	38

National Center for Building Community Trust and Justice

Overview

This FY 2014 grant announcement is to support the National Center for Building Community Trust and Justice. This initiative is funded under the Department of Justice Appropriations Act, 2014. The DOJ components combining funding under this solicitation are listed below.

- Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP)
- Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS)
- Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA)
- Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice (NIJ)
- Office of Justice Programs, Office for Victims for Crime (OVC)
- Office on Violence Against Women (OVW)

Funding for this initiative is authorized by 28 U.S.C. 530C and as follows:

- This program is partially funded under the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention's Juvenile Mentoring program, Community Based Violence Prevention program and Youth Gang prevention program, which are authorized by Paragraphs (2), (3)(b), and (5) under the Juvenile Justice heading, in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 2014, Pub. L. No. 113-76, 128 Stat. 5, 64-65.
- This program is partially funded under the Community Policing Development (CPD) Program authorized under the technical assistance authority of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (42 USC 3796dd(d)). CPD funding may be used to provide technical assistance to state, local and tribal governments, including their law enforcement agencies, in furtherance of the purposes of the Public Safety Partnership and Community Policing Act of 1994 ("the 1994 Act") (42 USC 3796dd(d)(1)). One of the purposes of the 1994 Act is to "provide additional and more effective training to law enforcement officers to enhance their problem solving, service, and other skills needed in interacting with members of the community" (Pub. L. No. 103-322, title I, § 10002(2)). Technical assistance may include, but is not limited to, the development of flexible models, strategies and methodologies for implementing community or problem-oriented policing (42 USC 3796dd(d)(2)) and the establishment and operation of training centers or facilities to provide instruction on community or problem-oriented policing and police-community interaction and cooperation (42 USC 3796dd(d)(3)).
- This program is partially funded under the Edward Byrne Memorial Competitive Grant Program (Byrne Competitive Program) and the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program, authorized by Paragraph (3), under the Justice Assistance heading, in the Department of Justice Appropriations Act, 2014, Pub. L. No. 113-76, 128 Stat. 5, 61. The Byrne Competitive Program helps communities improve the functioning and capacity of their state and local criminal justice systems and provides for national support efforts including training and technical assistance programs strategically targeted to address local, state and tribal needs. Funds may not be used for the acquisition of land, construction projects, or security enhancements or equipment to non-governmental entities not engaged in

law enforcement, law enforcement support, criminal or juvenile justice, or delinquency prevention.

- This program is partially funded under the National Institute of Justice's Research, Development and Evaluation program authorized pursuant to Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (sections 201 and 202).
- This program is partially funded in part through section 42 U.S.C. 10603 (c)(1)(A) of the Victims of Crime Act, which provides funding for training, technical assistance, and demonstration projects.
- This program is partially funded under section 40002(b)(11) of the Violence Against Women Act, as amended, which provides funding for training and technical assistance.

A substantial portion of the U.S. population has contact with the criminal justice system each year. According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) Police-Public Contact Survey, in 2008, approximately 40,015,000 U.S. residents age 16 or older had contact with the police in the preceding 12 months.¹ In the same year, almost 7 million persons aged 12 and over reported being the victims of a crime to the police.² Contact with the criminal justice system, as either victim or offender, is particularly prevalent for communities of color. A

recent study showed that one-half of all young men of color have at least one arrest by age 23³, and African Americans are substantially more likely to be the victims of violent crimes than whites, Asians, or Hispanic/ Latinos.⁴ Every one of these contacts is a potential opportunity to build personal and public confidence in the criminal and juvenile justice systems and enhance community efficacy and safety, or alternatively, to cause tension and erode public trust in the institutions charged to maintain law and order.⁵

Community trust is an established and highly honored relationship between an agency and the citizens it has been entrusted to serve.

Gaffigan, Steven J., and Phyllis P. McDonald, eds., Police Integrity: Public Service With Honor (pdf, 103 pages), Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, January 1997, NCJ 163811.

Research on procedural justice and community trust shows that people, both youth and adults, who perceive that they are treated fairly and respectfully by police report positive impressions of

¹Eith, Christine and Matthew R. Durose. Bureau of Justice Statistics, "Contacts between police and the public, 2008." Last modified October 01, 2011. Accessed February 3, 2014. <http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/cpp08.pdf>.

² Less than 42 percent of crime victims reported their victimizations to the police. (Bureau of Justice Statistics, "Criminal victimization in the United States, 2008 statistical tables." Last modified March 01, 2010. Accessed February 3, 2014. <http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/cvus08.pdf>.)

³ Brame, Robert, Shawn D. Bushway, Ray Paternoster, and Michael G. Turner. "Demographic patterns of cumulative arrest prevalence by ages 18 and 23." *Crime & Delinquency*. (2014). DOI: 10.1177/0011128713514801 (accessed February 3, 2014).

⁴ Truman, Jennifer, Lynn Langton, and Michael Planty. Bureau of Justice Statistics. "Criminal Victimization, 2012." Last modified September 24, 2013. Accessed February 3, 2014. <http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/ascii/cv12.txt>.

⁵ Horowitz, Jake. "Making every encounter count: Building trust and confidence in the police." *NIJ Journal*. (2007): 8-11.

law enforcement even when the interaction results in a sanction.⁶ This phenomenon extends to people who have not had personal contact with law enforcement but are influenced by their understanding of the experiences of people they know and by media reports. Individual experiences with and perceptions of law enforcement can in turn shape broader community responses and either support or inhibit informal controls theorized to be more effective in improving public safety than direct police intervention.⁷

There are other reasons to be attentive to procedural justice and community trust and the related concepts of implicit bias and racial reconciliation. Unjust interactions by police can be civil rights violations, lead to wrongful convictions, and harm crime victims. If police are distrustful of the communities they serve, it is more difficult for them to protect and serve effectively. Officer safety may even be improved in communities where citizens and police share a commitment to mutual trust and fairness.⁸

In the wake of the verdict in the Trayvon Martin murder trial, both President Obama and Attorney General Holder spoke powerfully—and personally—about issues of race, violence, and tensions between communities of color and law enforcement. Attorney General Eric Holder highlighted these issues in his speech to the International Association of Chiefs of Police on October 21, 2013:

“A substantial body of research tells us that—when those who come into contact with the police feel that they are treated fairly—they are more likely to accept decisions by the authorities, obey the law, and cooperate with law enforcement in the future – even if they disagree with specific outcomes. Clearly, each of us has an opportunity, and a responsibility, to refocus on engagement with the individual communities we serve—by involving our fellow citizens in the process of establishing clear norms of behavior; by setting standards for right and wrong; and, ultimately, by relegating the era of suspicion and distrust to the past.”

A multi-faceted approach to enhance community trust can help repair and strengthen the relationship between law enforcement and communities of color when it includes three key concepts: procedural justice, bias reduction, and racial reconciliation. The links among these elements create an environment for effective partnerships between the police (and criminal and juvenile justice systems) and the citizens they serve. This collaboration will provide an incentive to identify and solve problems collaboratively to transform the community and improve public safety. When these concepts are implemented successfully, law enforcement and the criminal justice responses are more effective.

OJP and its partner agencies are committed to building evidence and contributing quality research to the criminal justice and juvenile justice fields on procedural justice, implicit bias, and racial reconciliation. The building blocks for this knowledge creation are the piloting and testing

⁶ Tyler, Tom R. and Jeff Fagan. "Legitimacy and cooperation: Why do people help the police fight crime in their communities?" *Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law*, 6 (2008): 231-275.

⁷ Tyler, Tom R., Jonathan Jackson, and Ben Bradford, "Psychology of Procedural Justice and Cooperation," in *Encyclopedia of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, eds. G. Bruinsima and David Weisburd (New York: Springer-Verlag, 2012).

⁸ The National Crime Prevention Council, "Improving Police-Community Relations Through Community Policing." Accessed February 4, 2014. www.ncpc.org.

of innovative ideas and developing models for more rigorous evaluation in the future. The initiative funded under this grant announcement will support this early knowledge and model building through the piloting of innovative strategies to address procedural justice, implicit bias, and racial reconciliation and assessment and dissemination of information about those activities.

Deadlines: Registration and Application

Applicants must register with Grants.gov prior to submitting an application. 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. The deadline to apply for funding under this announcement is 11:59 p.m. eastern time on June 18, 2014. See “How to Apply” on page 34 for details.

Eligibility

Refer to the title page for eligibility under this program.

Purpose

The purpose of this initiative is to explore, advance, assess, and disseminate information about strategies intended to enhance procedural justice, reduce implicit bias, and support racial reconciliation. This initiative furthers the Department’s mission to ensure public safety and to ensure fair and impartial administration of justice for all Americans. In order to leverage the Department of Justice involvement in this area, this initiative is operated as a partnership among OJP, the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) Office, Office on Violence Against Women (OVW), and Community Relations Service (CRS). The initiative involves multiple activities, including managing pilot sites; establishing an information clearinghouse; conducting research; translating research for practitioner audiences; and developing strategies to further the public discourse about procedural justice, reducing bias, and supporting racial reconciliation as a means to build community trust.

OJP and COPS have been supporting projects on both conceptual and practical aspects of these topics for several years. Their work encompasses research, training, technical assistance and practitioner-oriented programs focusing on police legitimacy, racial bias, racial reconciliation, procedural justice, racial profiling, over-incarceration, and youth violence. Likewise, these issues have been at the center of the Civil Rights Division’s pattern and practice litigation which has resulted in notable remedial measures with several law enforcement agencies across the country. Additionally, the Community Relations Service (CRS) has been working on utilizing conflict resolution tools in issues of racial tension, police legitimacy and law enforcement-community relations for several years and has a number of related engagements under way. OVW support includes training and technical assistance to improve the justice system response to traditionally underserved communities, as well as grant programs that fund culturally-specific community-based organizations to address the critical needs of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence and stalking victims in a

People who perceive that they received “procedural justice” are also likely to perceive the police as legitimate and trustworthy and are likely to comply in the future. Procedural justice is the notion that a process is fair and that people have the opportunity to be heard, are treated politely and respectfully, and are judged by a neutral system free of bias.

Tom R. Tyler and Jeff Fagan. "Legitimacy and cooperation: Why do people help the police fight crime in their communities?" *Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law*, 6 (2008): 231-275.

culturally-appropriate way. While work in this field is ongoing, publications and resources are not easily available, centrally located, or concisely synthesized for a practitioner audience. Moreover, there is great demand for intensive technical assistance to enable more jurisdictions to do this work.

Under this initiative, DOJ is funding some critical first steps to align and accelerate ongoing and emerging efforts to help communities adopt and test three key concepts: procedural justice, bias reduction, and racial reconciliation, particularly in communities of color. The goals and deliverables described in this announcement will become the cornerstone of a longer term effort the Department hopes will be further-reaching in terms of both scope and transformative effect. The existing literature focuses the discussion of procedural justice on law enforcement and fair and equitable treatment of all citizens. The Department intends for this initiative to build on that literature by considering, testing, and refining strategies to expand theories about procedural justice, bias reduction, and racial reconciliation throughout the criminal justice system.

National Center for Building Community Trust and Justice —Specific Information

Background

What is Procedural Justice?

Procedural justice is a key component in public trust of law enforcement and public perception of the legitimacy of police (and criminal justice system) authority.⁹ Police require voluntary cooperation from the general public to be effective in controlling crime and maintaining order. This requires mutual trust and respect. Research shows that citizens are more likely to comply and cooperate with police and obey the law when they view the police as legitimate.^{10,11,12,13} Tyler (2006, 375) defines legitimacy as “a psychological property of an authority, institution, or social arrangement that leads those connected to it to believe that it is appropriate, proper, and just.” The defining feature of a legitimate authority is that people feel obliged to voluntarily comply with that authority’s directive. This

Procedural justice (sometimes called procedural fairness) describes the idea that how individuals regard the justice system is tied more to the perceived fairness of the *process* and how they were treated rather than to the perceived fairness of the *outcome*. In other words, even someone who receives a traffic ticket or “loses” his case in court will rate the system favorably if he feels that the outcome is arrived at fairly.

Emily Gold, *Deputy Director of Planning and Development at the Center for Court Innovation with Melissa Bradley, COPS Office. Community Policing Dispatch. The e-newsletter of the COPS Office | Volume 6 | Issue 9 | September 2013*

⁹ Mazerolle, Lorraine, Sarah Bennett, Jacqueline Davis, Elise Sargeant, and Matthew Manning, "Legitimacy in policing," *Crime Prevention Research Review*, 10 (2013).

¹⁰ Tyler, Tom R. *Why People Obey the Law*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006).

¹¹ Tyler, Tom R. "The psychology of legitimacy: A relational perspective on voluntary deference to authorities," *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 1, no. 4 (1997): 323-345.

¹² Tyler, Tom R. and Jeff Fagan. "Legitimacy and cooperation: Why do people help the police fight crime in their communities?" *Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law*. (2008):231–275.

¹³ Tyler, Tom R. and Yuen J, Huo. *Trust in the Law: Encouraging Public Cooperation with the Police and Courts*. (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2002).

sense of obligation is distinct from compliance out of fear of punishment or expectations of reward.¹⁴

Law enforcement can build public trust first by addressing and eliminating police conduct that violates the Constitution or civil rights laws. Police can also increase citizen perceptions of legitimacy and build community trust by including citizen participation in the proceedings prior to decision making, expressing neutrality in making the decision, showing dignity and respect toward citizens throughout interaction, and conveying trustworthy motives.^{9,10,11,12}

What Is Implicit Bias?

Institutional and intentional biases within the criminal and juvenile justice systems which explicitly discriminate against individuals or groups based on characteristics such as ethnicity, gender, ability, language preference, and other factors are illegal.

Implicit bias refers to a collection of unconscious attitudes or beliefs that manifest in behavior towards persons or groups. These implicit biases are automatic, difficult to control, and can affect behavior in profound ways. Implicit bias also compromises the effective disbursement of justice and promotion of public safety. Law enforcement has an affirmative obligation to eliminate the effect of bias.

There is a solid body of literature on the effect of bias in police work and model programs, procedures, and policies to identify and reduce its effect as a means to enhance procedural justice. Means through which some law enforcement agencies have sought to address and eliminate implicit bias include training; programming to measure, track, and address bias through the collection of data; awareness raising; enhanced supervision; and specific accountability measures.^{15,16,17} Under this initiative, such strategies would be replicated and tested in pilot sites.

¹⁴ Tyler, Tom R., "Psychological perspectives on legitimacy and legitimation." *Annual Review of Psychology*. (2006): 375-400.

¹⁵ Mentel, Zoe. *Racial Reconciliation, Truth-Telling, and Police Legitimacy*. Washington, D.C.: Community Oriented Policing Services Office, 2012.

¹⁶ Fridell, Lorie A., and Michael Scott. "Enforcement agency responses to racially biased policing and the perceptions of its practice," in *Critical Issues in Policing: Contemporary Readings, 5th Edition*, eds. Roger G. Durham and Geoffrey P. Alpert. (Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, Inc., 2005).

¹⁷ Fridell, Lorie A. "Racially biased policing: The law enforcement response to implicit black-crime association," in *Racial Divide: Racial and Ethnic Bias in the Criminal Justice System*, eds. Michael J. Lynch, Britt Patterson, and Kristina K. Childs (Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press, 2008).

What Is Racial Reconciliation?

Racial reconciliation is a process through which both criminal justice system practitioners and communities can acknowledge past and present harms and together move beyond them.¹⁸

Racial reconciliation strategies have been incorporated into programs emphasizing focused deterrence, such as the “Operation Ceasefire” gang violence intervention and the “High Point” drug market intervention.¹⁹ There is a dearth of evidence on the effectiveness of racial reconciliation strategies and this initiative provides the opportunity to test and improve these strategies to achieve racial reconciliation.

Procedural Justice and Victims of Crime

The concepts of procedural justice, equity, bias, and reconciliation also affect victims of crime. To many crime victims, the criminal justice system can be a confusing and intimidating experience, even under the best of conditions. For victims of crimes such as sexual assault or domestic violence, it takes great courage and fortitude to come forward and report the crime to law enforcement. How the victim perceives that initial contact with the 911 call taker, the police, the prosecutor, and even the victim advocate can have a significant impact on whether a victim actively participates in an investigation and how the victim recovers.

Earning the trust of the victim should be foremost in the mind of law enforcement, prosecutors, and advocates. Not only could it result in better outcomes in the criminal and juvenile justice systems, it increases the possibility that the victim will feel a sense of justice, regardless of the actual outcome and assist the victim’s recovery from the trauma of the crime. The concept of “justice” can mean many things to a victim of crime—and it is not always a successful conviction in court. Victims from racial and ethnic minorities are not always perceived or treated as victims by law enforcement, especially youth from African-American communities. For these victims, being treated with dignity and respect throughout the criminal justice process is paramount to achieving a sense of fairness. For others, being able to speak openly to the advocate or prosecutor about the victimization without being judged is validating in itself. Many victims are able to find justice even in cases that are dropped or when a defendant is found not guilty, as

Racial Reconciliation and Truth Telling is shorthand for a process of airing grievances and misunderstandings between minority communities affected by violence and overt drug markets and the law enforcement agencies that serve these communities. These misunderstandings and grievances are explicitly racial and prevent real working partnerships necessary for sustained public safety and healthy communities. In order to achieve a —re-settingll of this community-police relationship, grievances must be openly acknowledged and some of these misunderstandings must be aired and de-bunked. Through this process, communities and law enforcement can come to see that (1) they misunderstand each other in very important ways; (2) both have been contributing to harms neither desires; (3) both want, in crucial areas, fundamentally the same things; and (4) there is an immediate opportunity for partnership that can concretely benefit both the community and its guardians.

Crandall, Vaughn and David M. Kennedy. National Network for Safe Communities, "Truth-Telling and Racial Reconciliation between Law Enforcement and Affected Communities." Accessed February 3, 2014. www.nnscommunities.org/RACE_AND_RECONCILIATION_FINAL.pdf.

¹⁸ Crandall, Vaughn and David M. Kennedy. National Network for Safe Communities, "Truth-Telling and Racial Reconciliation between Law Enforcement and Affected Communities." Accessed February 3, 2014. www.nnscommunities.org/RACE_AND_RECONCILIATION_FINAL.pdf.

¹⁹ Mentel, Zoe. *Racial Reconciliation, Truth-Telling, and Police Legitimacy*. Washington, D.C.: Community Oriented Policing Services Office, 2012.

long as they feel they are treated fairly throughout the process and have a sense of empowerment over case proceedings.^{20,21}

Recognizing the role that procedural justice plays in the area of crime victimization is essential to improving victim satisfaction within the criminal and juvenile justice systems and quite possibly, to increasing victim cooperation and healing and enhancing victim safety. Understanding that justice can mean different things to different victims will help in our understanding of how procedural justice impacts the experience of crime victims.

The Intersection of Procedural Justice and Youth and Race and Ethnicity

Statistics regarding the disproportionate impact of incarceration and justice system involvement on African Americans are extremely sobering. In the United States, nearly one out of every three black men in their twenties is in jail or prison, on probation or parole, or otherwise under criminal justice control. Overall, black males were 6 times and Hispanic males 2.5 times more likely to be imprisoned than white males in 2012.²² According to the Bureau of Justice statistics, Latinos are the fastest growing minority group in the prison system. In 10 states, Latino men are incarcerated at rates between five and nine times greater than whites. In four states, Latino youth under the age of 18 are incarcerated at adult facilities at rates between 7 and 17 times greater than those of white youths.²³

When it comes to juveniles the rates of disproportionality are just as concerning. It is no surprise, then, that so many youth of color distrust, fear, and question the fairness of the U.S. justice system. Youth often report that they feel targeted and profiled by law enforcement as offenders, and that police procedures and decision making are unfair and biased.²⁴

The juvenile justice system must be fair and must be perceived as fair in order to be effective. Yet it has long been the case that youth of color have much more frequent contact with the justice system than white youth, a disparity that is not fully explained by differences in delinquency. In nearly all juvenile justice systems youth of color also remain in the system longer than white youth. While black youth account for 17% of the youth population, they represent 28% of juvenile arrests, 37% of the detained population, 38% of those in secure placement, and 58% of youth committed to state adult prison.

The Sentencing Project, "Disproportionate Minority Contact." Accessed February 3, 2014. www.sentencingproject.org/doc/publications/publications/ji_DMCfactsheet.pdf.

²⁰ Gerald T. Hotaling and Eve S. Buzawa. "Victim Satisfaction with Criminal Justice Case Processing in a Model Court Setting." Unpublished grant report available from NCJRS (NCJ 195668) at www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/195668.pdf.

²¹ Wemmers, Jo-Anne. "Victim experiences with the criminal justice system and their recovery from crime." *International Review of Victimology*. no. 3 (2013): 221-233.

²² Glaze, Lauren E., and Erinn J. Herberman. Bureau of Justice Statistics, "Correctional Populations in the United States, 2012." Last modified December 19, 2013. Accessed February 3, 2014. www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=4843.

²³ Human Rights Watch, "Race and Incarceration in the United States." Last modified February 27, 2002. Accessed February 3, 2014. www.hrw.org/legacy/background/usa/race/.

²⁴ Center for Constitutional Rights, "Stop and Frisk: The Human Impact." Last modified July 31, 2012. Accessed February 4, 2014. <http://stopandfrisk.org/the-human-impact-report.pdf>.

A growing body of literature suggests that children and youth recognize and evaluate fairness in legal processes²⁵ and respond to perceived inequities. Anecdotal perceptions of inequities and police bias that affect youth are borne out by statistics documenting the experience of young people. A recently published study from the University of South Carolina shows that nearly half of all black men in the United States are arrested at least once before the age of 23. About 30 percent of black men reported at least one arrest by age 18, according to the study. More than a third (38 percent) of white men were arrested by age 23; about 22 percent had an arrest by age 18²⁶. These results come from an analysis of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1997, which tracks the lives of 9,000 people who were between the ages of 12 and 17 in 1997.

Researchers posit that a number of factors influence the disproportionate contact that youth of color have with the juvenile justice and criminal justice systems. These factors include:

- Selective enforcement of delinquent behavior
- Differential opportunities for treatment
- Institutional racism
- Indirect effects of socioeconomic factors
- Differential offending
- Biased risk assessment instruments
- Differential administrative practices
- Unequal access to effective legal counsel
- Legislative policies that disparately impact youth of color
- “Zero-tolerance” policies in school

Further, researchers note that aggressive law enforcement strategies, such as “zero tolerance,” misapplication of “broken windows” enforcement, can negatively affect youth perceptions of procedural justice and police legitimacy. These findings suggest that there may be more serious consequences for youth in communities where these more intensive strategies are deployed.

What Are the Links Between Procedural Justice, Bias, Equity, Reconciliation, and Public Trust?

It is well documented that communities of color may experience the criminal justice system as discriminatory. At each stage in a criminal proceeding there are experiences faced by individuals of color, including racial profiling, prosecutorial discretion that results in different outcomes for defendants of color, and underrepresentation of minorities on juries.²⁷ These factors contribute to a perception of discriminatory treatment, and coupled with higher rates of

²⁵ Weisz, Victoria, Twila Wingrove, and April Faith-Slaker. "Children and procedural justice." *Court Review*. no. 1/2 (2007): 36-43.

²⁶ Brame, Robert, Shawn D. Bushway, Ray Paternoster, and Michael G. Turner. "Demographic patterns of cumulative arrest prevalence by ages 18 and 23." *Crime & Delinquency*. (2014). DOI: 10.1177/0011128713514801 (accessed February 3, 2014).

²⁷ Jweied, Maha, and Miranda Jolicoeur. US Department of Justice, "Expert Working Group Report: International Perspectives on Indigent Defense." Last modified September 01, 2011. Accessed February 3, 2014. <https://ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/236022.pdf>.

arrests and incarceration of African Americans and inadequate defender services, create a feeling of alienation from the criminal and juvenile justice systems managed predominantly by white prosecutors, public defenders and judges. This reality creates racially disproportionate collateral consequences in the criminal and juvenile justice systems, such as the increased need for foster care for black families and the denial of the right to vote to formerly incarcerated black men.²⁸

Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables

The research on procedural justice and related concepts is solid,²⁹ but still emerging. And while several jurisdictions are making headway in one of these areas (most frequently procedural justice), there are many more communities that would benefit from assistance that addresses not just one but all concepts at the same time. It is DOJ's intent under this initiative to further work already underway inside and outside the government on procedural justice which leads to making communities safer and a more effective criminal justice system.

The purpose of this initiative is to improve the criminal and juvenile justice systems through instilling procedural justice, reducing implicit bias, and supporting racial reconciliation by implementing the following five goals:

Goal 1: Establish pilot sites to implement and test strategies focused on procedural justice, implicit bias, and racial reconciliation.

The National Center for Building Community Trust and Justice will work intensively with five pilot sites for a period of 24 months, aiming to simultaneously (a) promote procedural justice in policing, (b) address issues of implicit bias, (c) create opportunities for racial reconciliation, and (d) encourage police departments to track the quality of interactions with the public.

While this work might start with police at the core, future iterations could expand to a whole range of justice organizations - probation, parole, district attorneys, judges, defense counsel, victim services, United States Attorneys, and others. Once the pilot sites have been selected, the Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys will play a coordinating role in connecting the grantee and site stakeholders with appropriate contacts at the local U.S. Attorney's Office. Beyond justice organizations, efforts to engage youth and adults in community- and trust-building could involve faith- and community-based organizations/leaders as well as law enforcement and other criminal and juvenile justice system components.

It is essential that impacted communities, including youth and victims, be highly engaged in this work. Applicants should describe how the project will engage the diverse communities in the jurisdiction, including low-income, minority, LGBTQI,³⁰ and women.

²⁸ King, Alice. "Collateral Consequences of Criminal Conviction: Five-State Resource Guide." Last modified 2007. Accessed February 3, 2014. www.nyls.edu/documents/justice-action-center/student_capstone_journal/capstone060704.pdf.

²⁹ The Campbell Collaborative reviews on procedural justice and focused deterrence found effects, as does CrimeSolutions.gov in the area of focused deterrence.

³⁰ LGBTQI is an abbreviation for the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer and intersexed community. (Green, Eli R., and Eric N. Peterson. LGBT Resource Center at UC Riverside, "LGBTQI Terminology." Accessed February 4, 2014. www.lgbt.ucla.edu/documents/LGBTTerminology.pdf.)

DOJ is particularly interested in using this initiative to implement strategies for working with youthful populations of color to enhance their trust in the criminal and juvenile justice systems. Applicants should outline plans for interventions specifically targeted for community members aged 17 and under.

Applicants' program designs for establishing and managing the pilot site component should address the following:

- How the research base around communities of color, procedural justice, and related concepts will inform the development of the pilot site component. It will be the grantee's responsibility to oversee the activities undertaken in the pilot sites and ensure they are based on the growing evidence about what works in these areas. Although the grantee should plan to work collaboratively with the selected sites to design site-specific approaches, the grantee will need to be able to justify the selection of the strategies used in each site.
- The means by which five sites will be selected for participation.
 - What is the most efficacious unit of implementation for this kind of work (e.g., block, census tract, neighborhood, other).
 - What criteria will be used to select / prioritize among potential pilot sites.
 - What selection method will be used (e.g. competitive, noncompetitive, or a hybrid method).
- Describe what activities and strategies the pilot sites might undertake to reach youth in the community. Sample evidence-based strategies for working with youth could include:
 - Gang and youth violence prevention and intervention and related activities, and community-based violence prevention initiatives including public health approaches for reducing shootings and violence.
 - Mentoring strategies that have been proven to be effective³¹ such as:
 - Ensuring proper mentor-youth matching, taking into account individuals' weaknesses and skills.
 - Providing ongoing training and support for mentors in order to maintain and improve their relationship-building capabilities.
 - Building a network of support for the youth so that he or she feels appreciated and cared for in every aspect of his or her life.
 - Encouraging the mentee to show his or her care for the welfare of the community through volunteering.
- Describe what activities and strategies the pilot sites might undertake to promote procedural justice for victims of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence,

³¹ From page 9 MENTOR/National Mentoring Partnership, "How to Build a Successful Mentoring Program Using the Elements of Effective Practice." Last modified 2005. Accessed February 3, 2014. www.mentoring.org/downloads/mentoring_413.pdf.

and/or stalking in their communities. Strategies should promote victim safety and recovery and may include:

- Engaging local victim service providers and community-based organizations with experience providing services for racial and ethnic minorities or other underserved populations.
- Providing training for law enforcement, judges and other court personnel, probation and parole officers, prosecutors and other criminal justice professionals to enhance their ability to work with victims of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking.

Additionally, the National Center for Building Community Trust and Justice will develop technical assistance resources to meet the needs of the pilot sites. The focus of this grant announcement is to reach justice system practitioners and communities across the U.S. Applicants should propose projects that illustrate the capacity to provide services nationwide.

- Applicants should propose a technical assistance strategy which may include onsite and/or remote training, on site and/or remote coaching, facilitation of site strategic planning meetings, and other forms of assistance.
- Applicants should describe how technical assistance requests will be received, assessed, and filled; and how the impact of technical assistance delivered by the Center will be measured.
- In close consultation with DOJ, technical assistance tools and training developed under this initiative may be piloted with other OJP or COPS sites participating in other initiatives (e.g., Community Based Violence Prevention, Byrne Criminal Justice Innovation or the Building Neighborhood Capacity Program). These other sites may be useful test sites because their DOJ funded work is also grounded in research around procedural justice, police legitimacy, and community trust-building.
- Applicants should discuss how the work of the sites will be supported: e.g. through consultation, training, staff support, etc.

Applicants should also describe:

- What sites will be expected to accomplish over the 24 month time period. Key data points for tracking might include (among others) perceptions of procedural justice and safety, as well as stops, frisks, arrests, rate of citizen reporting to the police (including for crimes of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking), citizen complaints (review and disposition of), incarceration, crime rate, and rate of juvenile status and delinquent offenses (e.g., truancy incidents, loitering, curfew violations, police-juvenile contact and referrals (including school-based contacts)), diversion rates and other outcomes for youth and adults.
- How sites will be continually involved and supported throughout the process to ensure their full engagement in the program and their investment in the concepts of procedural justice, reducing implicit bias, and racial reconciliation.
- How sites' efforts will be documented and how fidelity to the models applied will be ensured throughout implementation.
- What deliverables will be prepared to document the pilot site component.

- How the pilot site program could be expanded over time to include up to 25 sites to facilitate more rigorous evaluation of the innovations tested in the pilot sites.

An important component of this initiative is the potential to add to the evidence base through data collection and assessment of the pilot site project component. There is an expectation of strong engagement from research partners in program design and ongoing assessment of pilot sites. As such, applicants should focus on the following:

- How sites will be assessed over the course of the pilot site project component.
- Selecting data to be collected that will allow the assessment of the impact of bias; for example: stop data by race; hit rates; civilian complaints by demographics; and case outcomes by race such as charging decisions, pleas, convictions (including for the crimes of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking), diversion rates and informal court handling for juveniles.
- A plan for using a national evaluator, local evaluators, or both and ensure that assessment activities benefit the Center, the sites themselves, and the broader criminal and juvenile justice communities. Applicants should consider ways in which the communities themselves can be engaged in and informed by assessment activities.

Applicants should propose a plan to ensure pilot site teams have time to meet, network, promote peer learning, and train together where such work will enhance the efficiency of the program. Applicants might propose a strategy for in-person cluster meetings, video conferences, webinars, and other modalities to maintain communication among the pilot sites, the project team, and DOJ.

Goal 2: Establish an information clearinghouse for the field.

The Center will serve as an information clearinghouse for the broader field of justice practitioners. The applicant should describe how they will:

- Design and support a website which houses model policies, research, publications, best practices, training materials, and other relevant web-based resources. The website should serve as a one-stop-shop for information on procedural justice, bias, and racial reconciliation and related topics relevant to the criminal and juvenile justice systems. The website should include links to resources within the government (e.g., the COPS portal at <http://cops.igpa.uillinois.edu/procedural-justice-resources>, CrimeSolutions.gov and non-governmental resources).
- Develop a resource kit for jurisdictions interested in implementing evidence-based activities to enhance procedural justice and address related concepts of equity, bias, and reconciliation. Products developed under this award related to evidence-based programs or practices must be aligned with evidence standards and criteria used for CrimeSolutions.gov, administered by NIJ.
- Receive and respond to requests for information from communities across the U.S.

Applicants are encouraged to propose other activities to make the information clearinghouse a useful resource to practitioners and policy makers. Examples of such activities might include:

- Plan and convene national and regional seminars/workshops where interested and motivated officials can learn about key strategies for advancing procedural justice, reducing implicit bias, and supporting racial reconciliation.
- Host conference calls, podcasts, and webinars, where experts and practitioners can review the challenges described above, using practical examples from across the country, and explain how community programs should be designed to address these challenges.
- Provide follow-up targeted technical assistance to jurisdictions that have specific questions based on the conference calls and webinars provided.
- Work with representatives of national and regional foundations active in aspects of procedural justice, bias reduction, and racial reconciliation to determine where proposals could leverage private investments.
- Develop a newsletter to publicize current and emerging topics of interest.

Goal 3: Develop evidence translation materials.

The National Center for Building Community Trust and Justice will use its resources to make extant and emerging research on procedural justice, bias, and racial reconciliation accessible to practitioners and policy makers. Evidence translation materials are distinguished by their emphasis on guiding policy or practice based on sound scientific evidence. Such materials emphasize transparency in identifying sources of evidence and potential limitations of evidence. Evidence translation materials might include case studies from the pilot sites, fact sheets, policy briefs, checklists, community or organizational assessment tools, syntheses of research, guides for practitioners, distance learning materials and other products proposed by the grantee and approved by DOJ.

Applicants should propose examples of materials that will benefit not only the pilot sites but also the field at large.

Goal 4: Conduct research to gauge and expand knowledge about procedural justice and related concepts.

The grantee will determine where important gaps exist in our understanding about the scope and impact of procedural justice and related concepts. Applicants should:

- Propose a plan to convene experts to develop a research agenda that will identify gaps in the evidence base about procedural justice and related concepts and map key areas for study, demonstration, and evaluation.
- Outline proposed research activities, including research questions and research designs to answer those questions, and identify the researchers who will lead these efforts. Such efforts might include randomized controlled trials to evaluate procedural justice programs, research on measuring trust and satisfaction, and studies of implicit biases in various components of the criminal justice system.
- Undertake key research projects that can be completed by the end date of the project (September 30, 2017).

In order to leverage DOJ efforts in this area, applicants should consider strategies to align their proposed projects with the National Policing Platform, which is currently surveying 100 agencies about police satisfaction. Applicants should review the report on “Community-based indicators of Police Performance” and Platform activities for 2014-2015. In addition, one of the goals for this initiative is to identify studies for review by CrimeSolutions.gov to enhance the site’s collection of studies in the area of procedural justice.

Goal 5: Promote the public discourse about procedural justice, implicit bias, and reconciliation.

Applicants should devise a strategy to promote broader public understanding of these issues among the general public, in order to influence the national discourse on race and policing and shape policy, practice, and police-community relations. Such a strategy might include focus groups, polls, briefings, and social media and public awareness campaigns. The object of this goal is to engage a broad set of communities in the discussion about relationships between law enforcement and the rest of the criminal and juvenile justice system and the- community and ways to build trust, particularly in communities of color.

Deliverables

The Grantee will provide a final report with a comprehensive overview and assessment of the project, covering all five goals. In addition, the following deliverables will be produced:

Goal	Deliverables	Time Frame
<p>Goal 1: Establish pilot sites to implement and test strategies focused on procedural justice and related concepts</p>	<p>Plan to identify, recruit, select, and assess five pilot sites</p> <p>Measures to be used to assess success in improving procedural justice at the pilot sites</p> <p>Performance measure data from sites</p> <p>Specific strategies for working with community members aged 18 and under</p> <p>Grantee sets targets and measures for sites; collects data</p> <p>Cluster meetings for DOJ, project staff, and site teams</p>	<p>Sites to be selected by February, 2015</p> <p>Sites operate February, 2015- August, 2017</p>

Goal	Deliverables	Time Frame										
	<p>Mechanism for tracking TA requests and responses including relevant measures such as: requestor, audience, number of participants, topic of TA, date delivered, assessment of TA services in pilot sites.</p> <p>Assessment of overall national pilot site component and individual assessment of each of fine pilot sites.</p>	<p>Throughout project period</p> <p>Every 6 months, with interim site assessment reports due:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1008 436 1414 779"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1008 436 1230 499">Reporting Period</th> <th data-bbox="1230 436 1414 499">Report Due to DOJ</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1008 499 1230 562">5/1/15-10/31/15</td> <td data-bbox="1230 499 1414 562">11/30/2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1008 562 1230 646">11/1/15-4/30/2016</td> <td data-bbox="1230 562 1414 646">5/31/2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1008 646 1230 709">5/1/16-10/31/16</td> <td data-bbox="1230 646 1414 709">11/30/2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1008 709 1230 779">11/1/16-4/30/17</td> <td data-bbox="1230 709 1414 779">5/31/2017</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>A final assessment report on the pilot sites will be due 9/1/2017.</p>	Reporting Period	Report Due to DOJ	5/1/15-10/31/15	11/30/2015	11/1/15-4/30/2016	5/31/2016	5/1/16-10/31/16	11/30/2016	11/1/16-4/30/17	5/31/2017
Reporting Period	Report Due to DOJ											
5/1/15-10/31/15	11/30/2015											
11/1/15-4/30/2016	5/31/2016											
5/1/16-10/31/16	11/30/2016											
11/1/16-4/30/17	5/31/2017											
<p>Goal 2: Establish an information clearinghouse for the field</p>	<p>Plans for national clearinghouse</p> <p>Design a mechanism for staffing the clearinghouse, receiving and processing information and technical assistance requests</p> <p>Website operational</p> <p>Resource Kit</p> <p>Other deliverables proposed by the grantee</p>	<p>Plans for national clearinghouse due to DOJ by 1/31/2015</p> <p>Website live by 4/30/2015</p> <p>Draft Resource Kit to DOJ for review by 6/30/2015</p> <p>Other deliverable due dates negotiated with DOJ</p>										
<p>Goal 3: Develop evidence translation materials</p>	<p>Grantee will propose deliverables such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> case studies fact sheets policy briefs checklists community or organizational assessment tools syntheses of research guides for practitioners distance learning materials 	<p>Deliverable due dates negotiated with DOJ</p>										

Goal	Deliverables	Time Frame
Goal 4: Conduct research to gauge and build knowledge about procedural justice and related concepts	Analysis of gaps in knowledge base Research agenda with proposed research questions to address gaps Convenings of researchers DOJ expects scholarly products to result from each award under this solicitation, taking the form of one or more published, peer-reviewed, scientific journal articles, and/or (if appropriate) law review journal articles, book chapter(s) or book(s) in the academic press, technological prototypes, patented inventions, or similar scientific products	Analysis due 9/30/2015 Draft research agenda due to DOJ for review by 9/30/2015 Other deliverable due dates negotiated with DOJ
Goal 5: Promote the Public Discourse about Procedural Justice, Bias, and Reconciliation	Develop strategy to promote broader public understanding of issues Deliver communication strategy	Deliverable due dates negotiated with DOJ

All of the strategies proposed to address the five goals and the associated deliverables should align with the overarching purpose of expanding the evidence base about procedural justice, bias reduction, and racial reconciliation.

Applicants should recognize that DOJ will own, among other rights, a reserved non-exclusive royalty free irrevocable right to reproduce, publish, or otherwise use or authorize others to use for any federal, state, or local purpose (in whole or in part, including in connection with derivative works) any work (including but not limited to any software applications) developed under an award or sub-award which is otherwise subject to copyright.

DOJ has elected to make this award through a cooperative agreement. Under a cooperative agreement there is significant government involvement in project design and implementation. The grantee can expect that DOJ and its component agencies will consult regularly on project activities and will review and approve grantee project plans, draft deliverables, and all major project components. DOJ may provide training for and technical assistance to the project team and / or the pilot sites under this initiative, for example, in best practices in implementing community relations-building activities, in which the DOJ Community Relations Service has nearly 50 years of experience. All activities, resources, and materials developed under this project must include clear and prominent reference to the Department of Justice³².

³² Requests to use the DOJ Seal on project materials will be reviewed and approved by DOJ.

Evidence-Based Programs or Practices

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

- improving the quantity and quality of evidence OJP generates;
- integrating evidence into program, practice, and policy decisions within OJP and the field; and
- improving the translation of evidence into practice.

OJP considers programs and practices to be evidence-based when their effectiveness has been demonstrated by causal evidence, generally obtained through one or more outcome evaluations. Causal evidence documents a relationship between an activity or intervention (including technology) and its intended outcome, including measuring the direction and size of a change, and the extent to which a change may be attributed to the activity or intervention. Causal evidence depends on the use of scientific methods to rule out, to the extent possible, alternative explanations for the documented change. The strength of causal evidence, based on the factors described above, will influence the degree to which OJP considers a program or practice to be evidence-based. OJP's CrimeSolutions.gov Web site is one resource that applicants may use to find information about evidence-based programs in criminal justice, juvenile justice, and crime victim services.

Amount and Length of Awards

DOJ expects to enter into one cooperative agreement award of up to \$4,750,000. The project period is 36 months: October 1, 2014 through September 30, 2017.

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

DOJ anticipates funding an expansion of this initiative in future years in order to leverage the initial investment under this program announcement subject to availability of funds.

Applicants should review the Budget section (see page 27) carefully for information about how funds should be allocated for different components of this program.

Budget 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. The 2014 salary table for SES employees is available at www.opm.gov/pay-leave. Note: A recipient may compensate an employee at a greater rate, provided the amount in excess of this compensation limitation is paid with non-federal funds. (Any such additional compensation will not be considered matching funds where match requirements apply.)

The Assistant Attorney General for OJP may exercise discretion to waive, on an individual basis, the limitation on compensation rates allowable under an award. An applicant requesting a waiver should include a detailed justification in the budget narrative of the application. Unless the applicant submits a waiver request and justification with the application, the applicant should anticipate that OJP will request the applicant to adjust and resubmit the budget.

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

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

OJP strongly encourages applicants that propose to use award funds for any conference-, meeting-, or training-related activity to review carefully – before submitting an application – the OJP policy and guidance on “conference” approval, planning, and reporting available at www.ojp.gov/funding/confcost.htm. OJP policy and guidance (1) encourage minimization of conference, meeting, and training costs; (2) require prior written approval (which may affect project timelines) of most such costs for cooperative agreement recipients and of some such 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 of the OJP "Other Requirements for OJP Applications" web page at www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/other_requirements.htm.

Violence Against Women Act Non-Discrimination Provision

The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 added a new civil rights provision that applies to all FY 2014 OVW grants. This provision prohibits OVW grantees and subgrantees from excluding, denying benefits to, or discriminating against any person on the basis of actual or perceived race, color, religion, national origin, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation, or disability in any program or activity funded in whole or in part by OVW. Additional guidance about this provision is available at www.ojp.gov/ocr/vawafaqs.htm. Additional information on the civil rights obligations of OVW funding recipients can be found in the FY 2014 Solicitation Companion Guide Under “Civil Rights Compliance.”

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.

Performance Measures

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. Performance measures for this solicitation are as follows:

Objective	Performance Measure(s)	Data Grantee Provides
<p>Establish pilot sites and provide them with training and technical assistance to implement and test theories and programs focused on procedural justice and related concepts</p>	<p>Percentage of deliverables that meet expectations</p> <p>Percentage of deliverables completed on time</p> <p>Percentage of training and technical assistance requests completed</p> <p>Number of agencies/organizations receiving training and technical assistance</p>	<p>During the current reporting period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of deliverables • Number of deliverables that meet expectation • Number of deliverables completed on time <p>During the current reporting period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of requests for training and technical assistance received from pilot sites • Number of requests for training and technical assistance that were completed • Number of agencies/organizations in the pilot sites receiving training and technical assistance
<p>Increase the knowledge and capacity of justice practitioners and policy makers through the establishment of an information clearinghouse and the provision of training and technical assistance.</p>	<p>Develop Clearinghouse website</p> <p>Percentage of deliverables that meet expectations</p>	<p>During the current reporting period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was the clearinghouse web site developed (reporting period ending 6/30/2015) <p>Number of deliverables to include (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource Kit

	<p>Percentage of information requests responded to</p> <p>Number of agencies/organizations receiving and sharing information</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uniform TTA request and response protocols • Other deliverables as negotiated with DOJ • Provide status updates on completion of key components of the strategy and communication plan. • Final comprehensive report providing an assessment of the pilot site component and individual assessments of each of the five sites. To include an overview of the project and a detailed description of the design, activities, outcomes of assessments, and deliverables completed as well as a discussion of the implications of the project findings for criminal justice practice and policy in the United States <p>During the current reporting period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Number of requests for assistance and information received ○ Number of requests that were responded to ○ Number of agencies/organizations receiving and sharing information
<p>Enhance and promote evidenced-based practices and emerging research on procedural justice and related concepts through the development and dissemination of evidence translation materials, tools and resources.</p>	<p>Number of materials developed</p> <p>Number of materials disseminated</p> <p>Number of research projects/studies initiated</p> <p>Number of research reports generated</p>	<p>During the current reporting period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Number of evidence translation materials developed ○ Number of evidence translation materials disseminated ○ Number of research projects/studies initiated ○ Number of research reports generated

OJP does not require applicants to submit performance measures data with their applications. Instead, applicants should discuss in their application their proposed methods for collecting data

for performance measures. Refer to the section “What an Application Should Include” on page 25 for additional information.

Note on Project Evaluations

Applicants that propose to use funds awarded through this solicitation to conduct project evaluations should be aware that certain project evaluations (such as systematic investigations designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge) may constitute “research” for purposes of applicable DOJ human subjects protection regulations. However, project evaluations that are intended only to generate internal improvements to a program or service, or are conducted only to meet OJP’s performance measure data reporting requirements likely do not constitute “research.” Applicants should provide sufficient information for OJP to determine whether the particular project they propose would either intentionally or unintentionally collect and/or use information in such a way that it meets the DOJ regulatory definition of research.

Research, for the purposes of human subjects protections for OJP-funded programs, is defined as, “a systematic investigation, including research development, testing, and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge” 28 C.F.R. § 46.102(d). For additional information on determining whether a proposed activity would constitute research, see the decision tree to assist applicants on the “Research and the Protection of Human Subjects” section of the OJP “Other Requirements for OJP Applications” web page (www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/other_requirements.htm). Applicants whose proposals may involve a research or statistical component also should review the “Confidentiality” section on that Web page.

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 negatively affect 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 that are determined to be nonresponsive to the scope of the solicitation, or that do not include the application elements designated by DOJ to be critical, will neither proceed to peer review nor receive further consideration. Under this solicitation, DOJ has designated the following application elements as critical: Program Narrative, Budget Detail Worksheet, and Budget Narrative. Applicants may combine the Budget Narrative and the Budget Detail Worksheet in one document. However, if an applicant submits only one budget document, it must contain **both** narrative and detail information.

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

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

The SF-424 is a required standard form used as a cover sheet for submission of pre-applications, applications, and related information. Grants.gov and OJP’s Grants Management

System (GMS) take information from the applicant's profile to populate the fields on this form. When selecting "type of applicant," if the applicant is a for-profit entity, select "For-Profit Organization" or "Small Business" (as applicable).

2. Project Abstract

Applications should include a high-quality project abstract identifying the applicant's name, title of the project, and the dollar amount requested. The abstract summarize the proposed project in 400 words or less and should include goals of the project, a brief description of the strategies to be used, and a numerical listing of key/major deliverables.

Project abstracts should be—

- written for a general public audience.
- submitted as a separate attachment with "Project Abstract" as part of its file name.
- single-spaced, using a standard 12-point font (Times New Roman) with 1-inch margins.

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

All project abstracts should follow the detailed template available at www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/Project_Abstract_Template.pdf.

Permission to Share Project Abstract with the Public: It is unlikely that DOJ 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. 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 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

The program narrative must respond to the solicitation and the Selection Criteria (1–4) in the order given. The program narrative should be double-spaced, using a standard 12-point font (Times New Roman is preferred) with 1-inch margins, and should not exceed 30 pages. Number pages "1 of 30," "2 of 30," etc.

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

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

- a. Statement of the Problem
- b. Project Design and Implementation
- c. Capabilities and Competencies
- d. Plan for Collecting the Data Required for this Solicitation's Performance Measures
DOJ does not require applicants to submit performance measures data with their application. Performance measures are included as an alert that DOJ will require successful applicants to submit specific data to DOJ as part of their reporting requirements. For the application, applicants should indicate an understanding of these requirements and discuss how they will gather the required data, should they receive funding.

4. Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative

Applicants should attend to the following requirements when developing their project budgets:

For purposes of documenting the use of particular funding streams under this initiative the awardee will be required to track separately funds expended on efforts in five categories:

- Between \$500,000 and \$1,000,000 must be programmed for research activities described under Goal 4 on page 17 (and in the Deliverables Table on page 18 under Goal 4). These funds may not be used for other project activities.
- \$200,000 should be used for appropriate activities under Goal 1 to implement mentoring strategies for youth age 17 and under in the pilot sites. These activities might include, for example:
 - Ensuring proper mentor-youth matching, taking into account individuals' weaknesses and skills.
 - Providing ongoing training and support for mentors in order to maintain and improve their relationship-building capabilities.
 - Building a network of support for the youth so that he or she feels appreciated and cared for in every aspect of his or her life.
 - Encouraging the mentee to show his or her care for the welfare of the community through volunteering.
- \$400,000 should be used for appropriate activities under Goal 1 to implement community-based violence prevention strategies in the pilot communities, such as violence prevention and intervention and related activities, and community-based violence prevention initiatives including public health approaches for reducing shootings and violence.
- \$400,000 should be used for appropriate activities under Goal 1 to implement gang reductions strategies in the pilot sites, such as gang prevention, education, and intervention and related activities.

Of the total \$1 Million used for mentoring, community-based violence prevention, or gang reduction purposes, no more than \$100,000 may be programmed for research or assessment of any of these youth-focused activities. Any funds programmed for research and assessment of these youth-focused strategies are in addition to, and not included in, the minimum \$500,000 research budget described in the first bullet above.

- \$500,000 must be used for appropriate activities under Goal 1 to implement strategies for promoting procedural justice for victims of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking at the pilot sites. These strategies should focus primarily on the particular issues faced by women who are victims of these crimes, but should also include strategies directed toward similarly situated male victims.

a. Budget Detail Worksheet

A sample Budget Detail Worksheet can be found at www.ojp.gov/funding/forms/budget_detail.pdf. Applicants that submit their budget in a different format should include the budget categories listed in the sample budget worksheet.

For questions pertaining to budget and examples of allowable and unallowable costs, see the OJP Financial Guide at www.ojp.usdoj.gov/financialguide/index.htm.

b. Budget Narrative

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

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

The narrative should be mathematically sound 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. Non-Competitive Procurement Contracts In Excess of Simplified Acquisition Threshold

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

5. Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable)

Indirect costs are allowed only if the applicant has a federally approved indirect cost rate. (This requirement does not apply to units of local government.) 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 assistance with identifying your cognizant agency, please contact the Customer Service Center at 1-800-458-0786 or at ask.ocfo@usdoj.gov. If DOJ is the cognizant federal agency, applicants may obtain information needed to submit an indirect cost rate proposal at www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/pdfs/indirect_costs.pdf.

6. Additional Attachments

a. Project Timeline

Include a Project Timeline with each project goal, related objective, activity, expected completion date, responsible person, or organization

b. Position Descriptions

Outline the roles and responsibilities of key positions and resumes for current staff, including experience working as a team.

c. Applicant disclosure of pending applications

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

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

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

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

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

Applicants should include the table as a separate attachment, with the file name “Disclosure of Pending Applications,” to their application. 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.”).

d. 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.

For purposes of this solicitation, research and evaluation independence and integrity pertains to ensuring that the design, conduct, or reporting of research and evaluation funded by DOJ grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts will not be biased by any personal or financial conflict of interest on the part of the investigators responsible for the research and evaluation or on the part of the applicant organization. Conflicts can be either actual or apparent. Examples of potential investigator (or other personal) conflict situations may include 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 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 project, 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 is a problem.

In the attachment dealing with research and evaluation independence and integrity, the applicant should explain the process and procedures that the applicant has 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. It should also identify any potential organizational conflicts of interest on the part of the applicant with regard to the proposed research/evaluation. If the 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. 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.

For situations in which potential personal or organizational conflicts of interest exist, in the attachment, the applicant should identify the safeguards the applicant has or will put in place to eliminate, mitigate, or otherwise address those conflicts of interest.

Considerations in assessing research and evaluation independence and integrity will include, but may 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.

7. Accounting System and Financial Capability Questionnaire

Any applicant (other than an individual) that is a non-governmental entity and that has not received any award from OJP within the past 3 years must download, complete, and submit this [form](#).

Selection Criteria

Priority consideration will be given to applications that reflect a high degree of collaboration and partnership with other organizations possessing expertise and experience in the areas of procedural justice, bias reduction, and racial reconciliation. Subrecipients might be selected for their expertise in a particular aspect of the project to ensure success in meeting the Department's expectations for this initiative. Applicants should include a robust discussion of the subrecipients' expertise and their planned contribution to the project. Applicants are strongly encouraged to include letters of intent or signed memorandum of understanding with key project partners indicating their support for the proposal and commitment to carrying out the project's goals and objectives.

The following five selection criteria will be used to peer review each application, with the different weight given to each based on the percentage value listed after each individual criterion. For example, the first criterion, "Statement of the Problem," is worth 15 percent of the entire score in the application review process.

1. Statement of the Problem (15 percent of 100)

Describe the need for a National Center to Build Community Trust and Justice to address the issues of procedural justice, implicit bias, and racial reconciliation. Provide specific data where available.

2. Project Design and Implementation (40 percent of 100)

- a. Describe how the national-scope project will reach the stated goals and objectives by providing a complete description of its design and proposed implementation. Address each of the elements discussed under the 5 project goals (see pages 12-18).
- b. Discuss the national significance of a program to improve procedural justice, reduce implicit bias, and promote racial reconciliation.
- c. Tie program activities to goals, objectives, deliverables, and the performance measures applicable to the project.
- d. Indicate each project goal, related deliverable, activity, expected completion date, numerically listed deliverables and responsible person or organization in an attached Project Timeline.
- e. Describe the plan for collecting data from pilot sites and conduct an assessment of the initiative.

3. Capabilities and Competencies (30 percent of 100)

- a. Demonstrate a high degree of collaboration and partnership with other organizations possessing expertise and experience in the areas of procedural justice, bias reduction, and racial reconciliation.
- b. Discuss the capacity of the proposed or current staff, including experience working as a team.
- c. Demonstrate experience in working with law enforcement at the regional and national level, as well as knowledge of procedural justice concepts and the evidence base around procedural justice, implicit bias, and racial reconciliation.

- d. Demonstrate commitment to citizen oversight of law enforcement.
- e. Demonstrate experience in working with low-income, minority, LGBTQI and youth communities.
- f. Demonstrate experience providing technical assistance about working with victims of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking.
- g. Demonstrate the ability and capability to implement the project successfully, including a strategy for working with key partner agencies.
- h. In an attachment, provide position descriptions outlining roles and responsibilities of key positions and resumes for current staff.
- i. In attachments, include letters of intent from proposed partners detailing the contributions, roles, and responsibilities of each to the overall project.

4. Plan for Collecting the Data Required for this Solicitation’s Performance Measures (5 percent of 100)

- a. Identify a plan for responding to DOJ performance measures and who will be responsible for data collection.
- b. Explain how the program’s effectiveness will be demonstrated. Describe how program data will be collected and how it will be assessed to measure the impact of proposed efforts.

5. Budget (10 percent of 100)

Provide a comprehensive budget for the entire project period that is complete, cost effective, and allowable (e.g., reasonable, allocable, and necessary for project activities). Budget narratives should generally demonstrate how applicants will maximize cost effectiveness of grant expenditures. Budget narratives should demonstrate cost effectiveness in relation to the goals of the project.³³ The budget section should show the allocation of a minimum of \$750,000 for research projects and deliverables and \$1,000,000 for youth-focused strategies. See the additional budget and budget narrative requirements on pages 27-28.

Review Process

OJP is committed to ensuring a fair and open process for awarding grants. DOJ 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. DOJ may use internal peer reviewers, external peer reviewers, or a combination, to review the applications. 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. Peer reviewers’ ratings and any resulting recommendations are advisory only. In addition to peer review ratings, considerations for award recommendations and decisions may include, but are not limited to, underserved populations, geographic diversity, strategic priorities, past performance, and available funding.

³³ Generally speaking, a reasonable cost is a cost that, in its nature or amount, does not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person under the circumstances prevailing at the time the decision was made to incur the costs.

The Office of the Chief Financial Officer, in consultation with OJJDP, reviews applications for potential discretionary awards to evaluate the fiscal integrity and financial capability of applicants, examines proposed costs to determine if the Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative accurately explain project costs, and determines whether costs are reasonable, necessary, and allowable under applicable federal cost principles and agency regulations.

Absent explicit statutory authorization or written delegation of authority to the contrary, all final award decisions will be made by the Assistant Attorney General, who may consider factors including, but not limited to, underserved populations, geographic diversity, strategic priorities, past performance, and available funding when making awards.

Additional Requirements

Applicants selected for awards must agree to comply with additional legal requirements upon acceptance of an award. OJP encourages applicants to review the information pertaining to these additional requirements prior to submitting an application. Additional information for each requirement can be found at www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/other_requirements.htm.

- Civil Rights Compliance
- Civil Rights Compliance Specific to State Administering Agencies
- Faith-Based and Other Community Organizations
- Confidentiality
- Research and the Protection of Human Subjects
- Anti-Lobbying Act
- Financial and Government Audit Requirements
- Reporting of Potential Fraud, Waste, and Abuse, and Similar Misconduct
- National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)
- DOJ Information Technology Standards (if applicable)
- Single Point of Contact Review
- Non-Supplanting of State or Local Funds
- Criminal Penalty for False Statements
- Compliance with [Office of Justice Programs Financial Guide](#)
- Suspension or Termination of Funding
- Non-profit Organizations

- For-profit Organizations
- Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA)
- Rights in Intellectual Property
- Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (FFATA)
- Awards in Excess of \$5,000,000 – Federal Taxes Certification Requirement
- Active SAM Registration
- Policy and Guidance for Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conferences (including Meetings and Trainings)
- OJP Training Guiding Principles for Grantees and Subgrantees

How to Apply

Applicants must register in, and submit applications through Grants.gov, a “one-stop storefront” 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.

DOJ 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 notified.

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 “&” 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:

- 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.

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. 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 funding

opportunity number is DOJ-2014-3797. The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance numbers for this solicitation titled “National Center for Building Community Trust and Justice are as follows:

16.751	Byrne Memorial Competitive Grant Program
16.726	Juvenile Mentoring Program
16.123	Community-Based Violence Prevention Program
16.544	Youth Gang Prevention
16.560	Research, Development and Evaluation
16.710	Public Safety Partnerships and Community Policing Grants
16.526	OVW Technical Assistance Program
16.582	Crime Victim Assistance Discretionary Grants

- 6. Complete the Disclosure of Lobbying Activities.** All applicants must complete this information. Applicants that expend any funds for lobbying activities must provide the detailed information requested on the form *Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL)*. Applicants that do not expend any funds for lobbying activities should enter “N/A” in the required highlighted fields.
- 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 an e-mail validation message from Grants.gov. The message will state whether the application has been received and 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.

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 an application, DOJ will review only the most recent valid version submitted.

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 e-mail the DOJ contact identified in the Contact Information section on page 2 **within 24 hours after the application deadline** and request approval to submit their application. The e-mail must describe the technical difficulties, and include a timeline of the applicant’s submission efforts, the complete

grant application, the applicant's DUNS number, and any Grants.gov Help Desk or SAM tracking number(s). **Note: DOJ 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
- failure to follow Grants.gov instructions on how to register and apply as posted on its Web site
- failure to follow each instruction in the OJP solicitation
- technical issues with the applicant's computer or information technology environment, including firewalls.

Notifications regarding known technical problems with Grants.gov, if any, are posted at the top of the OJP funding Web page at www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/solicitations.htm.

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 resume to ojppeerreview@lmbps.com. The OJP Solicitation Feedback email account will not forward your resume. **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

FY 2014 National Center for Building Community Trust and Justice

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 35)
- _____ Acquire or renew registration with SAM (see page 35)

To Register with Grants.gov:

- _____ Acquire AOR and Grants.gov username/password (see page 35)
- _____ Acquire AOR confirmation from the E-Biz POC (see page 35)

To Find Funding Opportunity:

- _____ Search for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov (see page 36)
- _____ Download Funding Opportunity and Application Package
- _____ Sign up for Grants.gov email notifications (optional) (see page 34)
- _____ Read [Important Notice: Applying for Grants in Grants.gov](#)

General Requirements:

- _____ Review "[Other Requirements](#)" web page

Scope Requirement:

- _____ The federal amount requested is within the allowable limit(s) \$ 4,750,000

What an Application Should Include:

- _____ Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) (see page 25)
- _____ Project Abstract (see page 26)
- _____ Program Narrative (see page 26)
- _____ Budget Detail Worksheet (see page 27)
- _____ Budget Narrative (see page 28)
 - _____ Employee Compensation Waiver request and justification (if applicable) (see page 21)
 - _____ Read OJP policy and guidance on "conference" approval, planning, and reporting available at www.ojp.gov/funding/confcost.htm (see page 22)
- _____ Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL) (see page 36)
- _____ Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable) (see page 28)
- _____ Additional Attachments (see page 29)
 - _____ Project Timeline
 - _____ Position Descriptions
 - _____ Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications
 - _____ Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity
- _____ Accounting System and Financial Capability Questionnaire (if applicable) (see page 31)