



Evaluation of Safe Start: Promising Approaches for Children Exposed to Violence

Program Announcement

Due Date: June 7, 2005

OJJDP

Table of Contents

Overview.....	1
Award Information.....	2
Eligibility	2
Review Process	2
GMS Registration	3
Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424).....	3
Assurances and Certifications.....	3
Budget Detail Worksheet (Attachment #1).....	3
Budget (10 points).....	4
Budget Format	4
Other Budget Considerations.....	5
Program Narrative (Attachment #2)	5
Problems To Be Addressed (10 points)	5
Management and Organizational Capability (10 points)	6
Evaluation Plan (Total: 70 points)	6
Evaluation Design (40 points)	7
Strategy for Engaging the Sites (10 points)	9
Investigating Resiliency as a Protective Factor (10 points).....	9
Dissemination of Evaluation Findings (10 points)	10
Other Attachments (Attachments #3-6)	10
Due Date	11
For Additional Information.....	11
Appendix A: Other Requirements	12
Anti-Lobbying Act.....	12
Civil Rights Compliance.....	12
Confidentiality and Human Subjects Protection.....	12
Coordination of Federal Efforts	13
Faith-Based and Community Organizations.....	14
Financial and Government Audit Requirements.....	14
Services to Limited English Proficient (LEP) Persons	14
Single Point of Contact Review	15
Suspension or Termination of Funding.....	15
Appendix B: Performance Measures	16
Appendix C: Data That Will Be Available to the National Evaluator—Performance Measures for the Safe Start: Promising Approaches for Children Exposed to Violence Program	17
Appendix D: Data That Will Be Available to the National Evaluator—Case Variables for Children Served	18
Appendix E: Application Checklist	19

Evaluation of Safe Start: Promising Approaches for Children Exposed to Violence

Overview

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) is requesting proposals for the design of the national evaluation of the Safe Start: Promising Approaches for Children Exposed to Violence program. The focus of the Safe Start Promising Approaches program is to help communities implement collaborative cross-agency service delivery strategies to reduce the impact of children's exposure to violence. Up to 14 sites will be selected to participate in the program, which will run for 4 years (from summer/fall 2005 through summer/fall 2009). The focus of the national evaluation is to assess which program strategies yield the best outcomes for children.

Under this solicitation for the Evaluation of Safe Start: Promising Approaches for Children Exposed to Violence, applicants are asked to submit an evaluation design to be implemented over 5 years, with a budget for up to \$1,000,000 for the first 12 months of work (approximately September 1, 2005–August 31, 2006). The goals of the evaluation are two-fold:

- ❖ To develop an evidence base of promising practices and policies that effectively reduce the harmful effects of children's exposure to violence and to identify practices that were not effective or had a negative effect.
- ❖ To disseminate results so that other communities may replicate the best practices identified by the evaluation.

The tasks associated with the national evaluation include:

- ❖ Designing and implementing a quasi-experimental evaluation of the Safe Start: Promising Approaches for Children Exposed to Violence program.
- ❖ Establishing a technical working group of independent experts in relevant fields who will provide advice and comment to the evaluator throughout the 5-year project.
- ❖ Planning and convening a 1-day meeting (in the Washington DC metropolitan area) to present the evaluation design to a group including up to 4 representatives from each of the 14 sites and 5 federal program staff.
- ❖ Meeting required reporting deadlines, including twice-yearly progress reports submitted to OJJDP (the reporting periods are July 1–December 31 and January 1–June 30). The national evaluator will also submit a final report in two versions—a technical report that will describe in detail the methodology, findings, and conclusions of the evaluation prepared as for publication in an academic journal and a second, shorter report written for practitioners about best practices. This practitioner-oriented report will be no longer than 12 pages and be written in clear, nontechnical language.

-
- ❖ Disseminating evaluation findings via several interim products and reports (see “Dissemination of Evaluation Findings” on page 10).

For additional information about the Evaluation of Safe Start: Promising Approaches for Children Exposed to Violence—including answers to frequently asked questions, a copy of the July 2004 program announcement for the Safe Start Promising Approaches sites, and details about upcoming applicant assistance audioconferences—see the application assistance resources available on the OJJDP Web site. To access these resources, go to the Current Funding page (<http://www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org/funding/FundingList.asp>) and click on “Evaluation of Safe Start: Promising Approaches for Children Exposed to Violence.”

Award Information

This award will be funded as a cooperative agreement. As such, applicants should anticipate a collaborative working relationship with OJJDP staff on the evaluation. Under this solicitation, applicants are asked to submit an evaluation design to be implemented over 5 years and a budget for up to \$1,000,000 for the first 12 months of work.

Note: *All funding dates and funding levels are contingent on the availability and timely appropriation of funds each year.* OJJDP estimates that the Evaluation of Safe Start: Promising Approaches for Children Exposed to Violence will be funded for up to \$1,000,000 annually for 4 years. The first project year will run approximately from September 1, 2005 to August 31, 2006. Each subsequent January for 3 years (2006, 2007, and 2008), the evaluator will submit a new annual budget for up to \$1,000,000 for the next project year (September–August). In January 2009, the evaluator will submit a final budget for the fifth year for up to \$500,000 for remaining data collection, data analysis, and report writing tasks.

Eligibility

OJJDP invites applications from public agencies (including state agencies, units of local government, public universities and colleges, and tribal governments) and private organizations (including nonprofit organizations and for-profit organizations who agree to waive any profit or fee).

Review Process

OJJDP is committed to ensuring a competitive and standardized process for awarding grants. Applications will be screened initially to determine whether the applicant meets all the eligibility requirements. Only applications submitted by eligible applicants and that meet all other requirements (e.g., application is complete, meets formatting requirements, and is responsive to the programmatic requirements of the solicitation, etc.) will be evaluated, scored, and rated by a peer review panel. All applications that proceed to peer review will be rated on a 100-point scale. Point values for individual selection criteria are presented below.

Peer reviewers’ ratings and any resulting recommendations are advisory only. All final grant award decisions will be made by the U.S. Department of Justice, which may also give consideration to geographic distribution and regional balance when making awards. Detailed information about OJJDP’s

peer review process can be found on the OJJDP Web site (<http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/funding/peerreview.html>).

GMS Registration

All applications responding to this program announcement must be submitted online through OJP's Grants Management System (GMS) (<https://grants.ojp.usdoj.gov>).

Applicants must register for this solicitation by selecting "Evaluation of Safe Start: Promising Approaches for Children Exposed to Violence" from the Funding Opportunities page in GMS. To register, applicants must select "Apply Now," read the warning message that appears, and select "Continue." *The deadline for applicants to register on GMS is May 2, 2005.*

Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424)

Applicants must complete the Overview, Applicant Information, and Project Information sections of GMS. These sections provide the information needed to generate the Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424), a standard form used by most federal agencies.

Applicants will need to provide the following information to complete the SF-424:

- ❖ *DUNS Number.* Applicants can request a free DUNS number by calling 800-333-0505. Applicants must have a DUNS number *before* beginning the application process.
- ❖ *CFDA Number.* The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number for this solicitation is 16.730, titled "Reduction and Prevention of Children's Exposure to Violence."
- ❖ *Type of Application.* Select "New" in the drop-down menu for "Type of Application."

Assurances and Certifications

Applicants are required to review and accept the "Assurances" and "Certifications Regarding Lobbying; Debarment, Suspension, and Other Responsibility Matters; and the Drug-Free Workplace Requirement" in order to receive federal funds under this program. To accept the Assurances and Certifications in GMS, select the Assurances and Certifications link and click the "Accept" button at the bottom of the screen. Please verify that the contact information (name, address, phone number, fax number, and e-mail address) for the applicant's authorizing official is correct.

Budget Detail Worksheet (Attachment #1)

The Budget Detail Worksheet—which must be submitted as a Microsoft Word document (.doc), Excel worksheet (.xls), PDF file (.pdf), or text document (.txt)—must include both a detailed worksheet itemizing all costs and a narrative explaining and justifying each budget item. *Be sure that the file name of the attachment includes the words "budget detail worksheet" (e.g., budget_detail_worksheet.doc).*

Budget (10 points)

The Budget Detail Worksheet must address the following selection criteria. Applicants must provide a budget that:

- ❖ Is complete, allowable, and cost effective in relation to the proposed activities.
- ❖ Shows the cost calculations demonstrating how the applicant arrived at the total amount requested.
- ❖ Provides a brief supporting narrative to link costs with project activities.
- ❖ Allots funds to plan and convene a 1-day meeting in the Washington DC metropolitan area during Fall 2005 for up to 4 representatives from each of the 14 program sites, any local evaluators called for in the national evaluation design proposal, and 5 cognizant federal staff.

OJP's *Financial Guide* (www.ojp.usdoj.gov/FinGuide/) will govern the administration of funds by the successful applicant (and contractors). The guide provides information on allowable (and nonallowable) expenses and other pre- and post-award financial requirements. (See "Financial and Government Audit Requirements" in appendix A.)

Budget Format

Applicants must submit a budget that includes *both* a detailed worksheet itemizing all costs and a narrative explaining and justifying each budget item:

- ❖ *Budget Worksheet.* The worksheet should provide the detailed computation for each budget line item. The worksheet must list the cost of each item and show how the cost was calculated. For example, costs for personnel should show the annual salary rate and the percentage of time devoted to the project for each employee paid through grant funds. The budget worksheet should present a complete and detailed itemization of all proposed costs.
- ❖ *Budget Narrative.* The narrative should describe each budget item and relate it to the appropriate project activity. It should closely follow the content of the budget worksheet and provide justification for all proposed costs. In the budget narrative, the applicant should explain how fringe benefits were calculated, how travel costs were estimated, why particular items of equipment or supplies must be purchased, and how overhead or indirect costs (if applicable) were calculated. The budget narrative should justify the specific items listed in the budget worksheet (particularly supplies, travel, and equipment) and demonstrate that all costs are reasonable.

A sample Budget Detail Worksheet form is available on the Grants/Funding section of OJP's Web site (www.ojp.usdoj.gov/forms.htm).

Other Budget Considerations

Applicants should be aware of these additional budget considerations:

- ❖ Applicants must submit a budget of up to \$1,000,000 to cover the first 12 months of work.
- ❖ The 12-month budget period should be September 1, 2005–August 31, 2006.
- ❖ For the purpose of estimating costs, applicants may assume that the Safe Start Promising Approaches sites will serve an average of 50 children per year.¹
- ❖ Total costs specified in the complete budget must match the amount provided in the Estimated Funding section of the Project Information screen in GMS.
- ❖ There is no match requirement.
- ❖ All funds listed in the budget will be subject to audit.

Program Narrative (Attachment #2)

Applicants must submit a program narrative that presents a detailed description of the problems to be addressed, management and organizational capabilities of the applicant, and proposed evaluation plan. The program narrative—which must be submitted as a Microsoft Word document (.doc), PDF file (.pdf), or text document (.txt)—must be double spaced, use a standard 12-point font (Times New Roman is preferred), have 1-inch margins, and not exceed 40 pages. (Please number pages “1 of 40,” “2 of 40,” and so forth.) *Be sure that the file name of the attachment includes the words “program narrative” (e.g., program_narrative.doc).* The program narrative must begin with a table of contents. The table of contents does not count against the 40-page limit of the program narrative. Applications that do not adhere to the required format may be deemed ineligible and may not be forwarded to peer review. The program narrative must address the following selection criteria.

Problems To Be Addressed (10 points)

In this section of the program narrative, applicants must:

- ❖ Demonstrate an understanding of the literature on the incidence and prevalence of children’s exposure to violence and the effects on children of such exposure.
- ❖ Demonstrate understanding of the concept of resiliency as a protective factor for children exposed to violence at risk of negative outcomes.

¹ There is expected to be wide variation in the number of children served by the sites. No minimum number of children to be served was specified for applicant sites because the applicants represent both very small and very large urban communities with different capacities for identifying and treating children and families in need.

-
- ❖ Demonstrate knowledge of the systems that respond to children exposed to violence, including, but not limited to, child protective services, schools, healthcare providers (including primary care, mental health, and public health), law enforcement, domestic violence service providers, early childhood care providers, and courts.

Management and Organizational Capability (10 points)

In this section of the program narrative, applicants must:

- ❖ Demonstrate the applicant institution's previous experience with and institutional capacity to manage a multi-site evaluation project of this size and scope.
- ❖ Outline a proposed staffing plan identifying key staff, describing their qualifications and experience, and identifying the percentage of time each key staff will devote to the project.
- ❖ Describe the applicant institution's experience developing and sustaining collaborative and participatory evaluator-research relationships with program sites, service providers, and community systems (in particular, child protective services, schools, healthcare providers including public health, law enforcement, and courts).

Applicants must support the description of their organizational and management capability by providing resumes of key personnel in the Other Attachments (see page 10).

Evaluation Plan (Total: 70 points)

In this section of the program narrative, worth 70 points in the peer reviewers' scoring, applicants must present an evaluation plan that proposes a structure for the evaluation and a detailed and specific evaluation design (using data provided by Safe Start Promising Approaches sites and comparison or control group sites identified and recruited by the evaluator) that meets the requirements described in this announcement (40 points), proposes a strategy to engage sites in the evaluation (10 points), describes a strategy for investigating resiliency as a protective factor for children exposed to violence (10 points), and presents a plan for disseminating evaluation findings (10 points). The evaluation design must address the following questions concerning the interventions implemented at the Safe Start Promising Approaches sites:

- ❖ Which intervention(s) are associated with positive changes in child outcome variables pre- to post- and comparison/control group versus treatment group?
- ❖ Which intervention(s) are associated with negative changes in child outcome variables pre- to post- and comparison/control group versus treatment group?
- ❖ Which intervention(s) are associated with no change in child outcome variables pre- to post- and comparison/control group versus treatment group?
- ❖ Are certain interventions more effective with certain populations of victims than others (e.g., children exposed to different types of violence, children exposed to different levels of chronicity and acuteness of violence, children from different demographic communities, girls versus boys)?

-
- ❖ What level of exposure to an intervention (“dose”) is associated with positive outcomes?
 - ❖ Are certain programmatic elements associated with positive outcomes for children (e.g., locus of intervention, particular participating agencies, etc.)?
 - ❖ What is necessary to replicate the “promising approaches” in other communities?

Applicants are invited to propose additional evaluation questions.

In addition to the narrative description of the evaluation plan, applicants must also submit a timeline or milestone chart that indicates major tasks in the proposed design, assigns responsibility for each major task, and plots completion of these tasks by month or quarter for the 5 years of the evaluation. This timeline/milestone chart should be submitted as a separate attachment (see “Other Attachments” on page 10).

Evaluation Design (40 points)

Applicants may propose a national evaluation strategy based either on a central effort directed and performed by the staff of the applicant organization, a decentralized model that incorporates contracts to site-based local evaluators, or a hybrid of both models. If a local evaluator model is proposed, the national evaluator should plan to include the sites in the process of identifying and selecting a local evaluator. Under this model, the local evaluator would be a consultant or contractor to the national evaluator, and the national evaluator would be responsible for supervising and monitoring the performance of the local evaluator. The applicant should propose a strategy for managing local evaluators if such are proposed. The applicant must address the potential challenges inherent in the chosen structure and demonstrate how they will be addressed.

The sites will be required to collect data on treatment group children twice yearly (see Appendix D for a list of the kinds of variables the sites will be required to collect. The national evaluator may add variables to this list as necessary).² At OJJDP’s request, the national evaluator may be required to provide technical assistance to any site that is encountering difficulty collecting the required data from children in the treatment group. The national evaluator should recommend instruments to collect the required data which can be employed by the sites (some of which may use paraprofessionals in the data collection role.) The national evaluator will identify, recruit, and collect comparable data twice yearly from a comparison or control group at each site.

The costs associated with recruiting study participants and data collection are assigned as followed:

- ❖ *Treatment group at each site.* The cost of collecting data from the treatment group children will be born by the Safe Start Promising Approaches sites. As noted in the FY 2004 Safe Start Promising Approaches program announcement, sites are required to allocate up to \$10,000 per year for this task (see appendixes C and D for the performance measures and case variables for which the sites must provide data).

² The sites will collect data on every child served at intake and at 6-month intervals post-intake or post-intervention. In addition to the data on children served, the sites will be responsible for collecting quarterly data on the performance measures identified in appendix C.

-
- ❖ *Comparison or control group at each site.* The cost of identifying, recruiting, collecting data from and implementing retention strategies for the control or comparison groups will be born by the national evaluator. These costs should be included in the budget submitted with this application for the Evaluation of Safe Start: Promising Approaches for Children Exposed to Violence.

The national evaluator may propose contracts with the sites to collect certain data (e.g., on resiliency from treatment group children) or to assist with recruiting a comparison or control group where the site has access to appropriate comparison or control cases.

The evaluation design proposed should be detailed and specific and include the following required components:

- ❖ A quasi-experimental methodology which clearly identifies the hypotheses to be tested and how the proposed methodology will maximize the ability to test these hypotheses.
- ❖ A strategy for identifying, recruiting, and retaining appropriate control/comparison groups, including a discussion of anticipated challenges and how they will be addressed for specific populations.
- ❖ A description of quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis methods, the tools to be used, and the applicant's expertise in these techniques. It is anticipated that both process evaluation and outcome evaluation components will be needed to effectively address the evaluation questions.
- ❖ Multiple levels of analysis, including analysis of pre- and post-intervention child-level data, cross-site comparison of child outcomes, comparison of outcomes for sites with similar interventions ("clusters"), and data aggregated across all the sites to address the evaluation questions.
- ❖ Procedures for collecting, managing, storing, and transmitting data, including data to be collected from comparison/control group subjects twice yearly. Applicants should identify the software and data verification procedures that will be used, describe the procedures that will be used to scrub data of identifying information for submission to OJJDP, and describe the procedures that will be used to facilitate longitudinal tracking of cases.
- ❖ A logic model linking evaluation questions, data elements, data sources, data collection strategies, and analytical techniques to the evaluator's operations in each site.

Applicants must also propose plans for establishing a technical working group of independent experts in relevant fields who will provide advice and comment to the evaluator throughout the 5-year project. Applicants should describe the size of the technical working group, its proposed membership (members need not be finalized), renumeration plans, and meeting schedules. Applicants should also identify specific review/advisory tasks to be undertaken by the technical working group.

When developing a procedure to collect data, the applicant should be aware of the following requirements:

- ❖ *Informed Consent Procedures.* Applicants must describe the procedures to be used to obtain informed consent from all families from whom the national evaluator will collect data. Informed

consent procedures must inform participants that case-level data without any identifying information will be reported to OJJDP. Sample informed consent forms should be included in the Other Attachments (see page 10).

- ❖ *Institutional Review Board Clearance.* Applicants must provide evidence of receipt of at least provisional institutional review board (IRB) clearance for data collection activities, including reporting case-level data scrubbed of identifiers to OJJDP, and submit evidence of such clearance in the Other Attachments (see page 10).
- ❖ *Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.).* Pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.), applicants should plan to have all data collection instruments and schedules approved by the OMB. The timeline/milestone chart should allow a minimum of 270 days for this purpose. Information about the Act is available at http://www.archives.gov/federal_register/public_laws/paperwork_reduction_act/3501.html.

See appendix A for more information about Confidentiality and Human Subjects Protection.

Strategy for Engaging the Sites (10 points)

Although the sites' participation in the national evaluation is mandatory, the national evaluator will have significant responsibility for engaging the sites as participants in the evaluation process. The successful applicant will demonstrate their ability to establish and maintain a collaborative, responsive, and mutually satisfactory relationship with the sites while adhering to standards of scientific rigor in implementing the evaluation.

Investigating Resiliency as a Protective Factor (10 points)

The national evaluator will propose and implement a strategy to investigate resiliency as a protective factor for children exposed to violence. Applicants should:

- ❖ Define appropriate measures of resilience (e.g. conflict resolution skills, problem solving skills, coping skills, achievement motivation, and independence).
- ❖ Identify instruments and techniques to collect information on resiliency.
- ❖ Describe a strategy for collecting these data on children in the treatment and comparison or control groups in each site.
- ❖ Propose hypotheses to be tested exploring the relationship between resiliency and exposure to violence.
- ❖ Test these hypotheses using Safe Start Promising Approaches data.

The evaluator may propose contracting with the sites to collect resiliency data as part of other site data collection responsibilities where appropriate.

Dissemination of Evaluation Findings (10 points)

In addition to the required semi-annual progress reports and final reports (see page 1), the national evaluator will be required to develop interim products to inform OJJDP and the Safe Start Promising Approaches sites about the implementation and outcomes of the program as the project proceeds. It is expected that at least one interim product per year will be produced and disseminated to the sites by the national evaluator.

The following is a list of examples of interim products:

- ❖ A description of the interventions implemented at each site.
- ❖ A literature review of the concept of children’s resiliency.
- ❖ A description of the evaluator’s study of resiliency.
- ❖ Article(s) suitable for publication in a peer-reviewed journal.
- ❖ Manuscripts for an OJJDP Bulletin series on the evaluation.

The applicant is invited to suggest other interim products.

The national evaluator will plan to make at least two presentations of evaluation findings at professional or research conferences, including the National Institute of Justice’s annual Research and Evaluation Conference, during the 5-year project period.

The applicant is invited to propose additional strategies for disseminating the findings of the evaluation to the sites and to researchers and practitioners.

Other Attachments (Attachments #3–6)

Applicants must submit the following materials as attachments to their GMS application. *Be sure that the file name for each attachment is descriptive of its contents (e.g., resumes.doc, timeline.doc, etc.).* The four attachments—which must be submitted as a Microsoft Word document (.doc), PDF file (.pdf), or text document (.txt)—are described below:

- ❖ **Resumes (Attachment #3).** Applicants should provide resumes of key personnel (see “Management and Organizational Capability” on page 6).
- ❖ **Timeline/Milestone Chart (Attachment #4).** Applicants should submit a timeline or milestone chart that indicates major tasks in the proposed design, assigns responsibility for each major task, and plots completion of these tasks by month or quarter for the 5 years of the evaluation (see page 7).
- ❖ **Sample Informed Consent Forms (Attachment #5).** Applicants must provide sample informed consent forms (see page 8).

-
- ❖ **Provisional IRB Clearance (Attachment #6).** Applicants must submit evidence of provisional institutional review board (IRB) clearance (see page 9).

*Please note: although the materials provided in the Other Attachments are not assigned specific point values, the peer reviewers will, when appropriate, consider these items when rating applications. For example, reviewers will consider any resumes submitted when assessing the management and organizational capabilities of the applicant. **Peer reviewers will not review any additional information other than that specified above.***

Due Date

Applicants must register for this funding opportunity by May 2, 2005, and completed applications must be submitted online through OJP's Grants Management System (<https://grants.ojp.usdoj.gov>) by 8:00 P.M. ET, June 7, 2005.

For Additional Information

For additional information about the Evaluation of Safe Start: Promising Approaches for Children Exposed to Violence—including answers to frequently asked questions, a copy of the July 2004 program announcement for the Safe Start Promising Approaches sites, and details about upcoming applicant assistance audioconferences (tentatively scheduled for April 27, 2005 and May 5, 2005 at 3 p.m. ET)—see the application assistance resources available on the OJJDP Web site. To access these resources, go to the Current Funding page (<http://www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org/funding/FundingList.asp>) and click on “Evaluation of Safe Start: Promising Approaches for Children Exposed to Violence.”

If you have a question about this solicitation, you may leave a telephone message at 202–305–9234. Program staff will return calls to offer clarification about solicitation requirements but cannot comment on substantive issues regarding your application.

Questions about the GMS system should be directed to the GMS Help Line at 1–888–549–9901. GMS questions will not be addressed by program staff.

OJJDP program staff cannot respond to direct phone calls or e-mails about the solicitation.

Appendix A: Other Requirements

Anti-Lobbying Act

Applicants should be aware that the Anti-Lobbying Act, 18 U.S.C. § 1913, recently was amended to expand significantly the restriction on use of appropriated funding for lobbying. This expansion also makes the anti-lobbying restrictions enforceable via large civil penalties, with civil fines between \$10,000 and \$100,000 per each individual occurrence of lobbying activity. These restrictions are in addition to the anti-lobbying and lobbying disclosure restrictions imposed by 31 U.S.C. § 1352. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) is currently in the process of amending the OMB cost circulars and the common rule (codified at 28 C.F.R. part 69 for U.S. Department of Justice grantees) to reflect these modifications. However, in the interest of full disclosure, all applicants must understand that no federally appropriated funding made available under this grant program may be used, either directly or indirectly, to support the enactment, repeal, modification or adoption of any law, regulation, or policy, at any level of government, without the express approval by OJP. Any violation of this prohibition is subject to a minimum \$10,000 fine for each occurrence. This prohibition applies to all activity, even if currently allowed within the parameters of the existing OMB circulars.

Civil Rights Compliance

All recipients of federal grant funds are required to comply with nondiscrimination requirements contained in various federal laws. In the event that a court or administrative agency makes a finding of discrimination on grounds of race, color, religion, national origin (see also “Services to Limited English Proficient (LEP) Persons”), gender, disability, or age against a recipient of funds after a due process hearing, the recipient must agree to forward a copy of the finding to the Office of Civil Rights, Office of Justice Programs. All applicants should consult the Assurances required to be submitted with the application to understand the applicable legal and administrative requirements.

Confidentiality and Human Subjects Protection

Applicants should be aware of the U.S. Department of Justice’s requirements for privacy and confidentiality in research and statistical efforts. These requirements are stipulated by 42 U.S.C. § 3879g. The U.S. Department of Justice has issued a specific regulation concerning the implementation of this statutory requirement in 28 CFR Part 22. In accordance with 28 CFR Part 22, applicants requesting funds for research or statistical activities must submit a Privacy Certificate with the application. The purpose of the Privacy Certificate is to ensure that the applicant has appropriate policies and procedures in place to protect the confidentiality of data identifiable to private persons. Specifically, the Privacy Certificate must be in compliance with the requirements of 28 CFR § 22.23. OJJDP has developed guidelines for preparing a Privacy Certificate in accordance with the confidentiality regulation. Copies of the Privacy Certificate Guidelines, a Privacy Certificate Face Sheet, and a Sample Attachment for a Privacy Certificate are available on the OJJDP Web site (<http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/funding/privacy.pdf>).

Applicants are further advised that any project that will involve the use of human research subjects must be reviewed by an institutional review board³ (IRB), in accordance with U.S. Department of Justice regulations at 28 CFR Part 46. IRB review is not required prior to submission of the application. However, if an award is made and the project involves research using human subjects, OJJDP will place a special condition on the award requiring that the project be approved by an appropriate IRB before federal funds can be disbursed for human subjects activities. Applicants should include plans for IRB review, where applicable, in the project timeline submitted with the proposal. A copy of “Confidentiality of Identifiable Research and Statistical Information (28 CFR Part 22)” is available on the OJJDP Web site (<http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/funding/confidentiality.pdf>).

Coordination of Federal Efforts

To encourage better coordination among federal agencies in addressing state and local needs, the U.S. Department of Justice requests that applicants provide information on the following: (1) active federal grant award(s) supporting this or related efforts⁴, including awards from the U.S. Department of Justice; (2) any pending application(s) for federal funds for this or related efforts; and (3) plans for coordinating any funds described in items (1) or (2) with the funding sought by this application. For each federal award, applicants must include the program or project title, the federal grantor agency, the amount of the award, and a brief description of its purpose.

³ Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) are the governing bodies that assure that data collection efforts are in accordance with all relevant local, state, and federal laws to protect human subjects. Background information on IRBs is available from the National Institute of Justice (www.ojp.usdoj.gov/nij/humansubjects/index.html) and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (www.hhs.gov/ohrp/).

Most local and state governments, colleges and universities, hospitals, and private contract research firms have IRBs in place. Agencies that might be able to help you find an IRB to review your data collection plans for the purpose of the application include a local jail, hospital, mental health treatment facility, public health agency, community college, or four-year college or university. Try calling these agencies, explain that you are submitting an application for federal funding and are required to collect data on the children that you serve, and you therefore need IRB clearance and ask if they have ever encountered this situation and what they did about it. It is likely that at least one of these agencies will have some experience they would be willing to share.

IRB reviews are now available from for-profit organizations, if the potential applicant does not have access to an IRB through his/her own institution. They cost about \$6,000-\$10,000, and those costs should be built into the first year's budget. One could find those firms by querying the term “Institutional Review Board” with any Internet search engine.

You do not need to have IRB clearance at the time your application is submitted to OJJDP. In your application, you can outline the process for getting IRB clearance in your community. If possible, you should start the process, so that you could say in your application that your study/plan/design is under review by an IRB and give the expected date for final clearance. Applicants are not required to get final clearance until/if you are funded. In fact, some IRBs won't review a study until after funding is secured.

⁴ “Related efforts” is defined for these purposes as one of the following: efforts for the same purpose (i.e., the proposed award would supplement, expand, complement, or continue activities funded with other federal grants); another phase or component of the same program or project (e.g., to implement a planning effort funded by other federal funds or to provide a substance abuse treatment or education component within a criminal justice project); or services of some kind (e.g., technical assistance, research, or evaluation) rendered to the program or project described in the application.

Faith-Based and Community Organizations

It is OJP policy that faith-based and community organizations that statutorily qualify as eligible applicants under OJP programs are invited and encouraged to apply for assistance awards. Faith-based and community organizations will be considered for an award on the same basis as any other eligible applicants and, if they receive assistance awards, will be treated on an equal basis with non faith-based and community organization grantees in the administration of such awards. No eligible applicant or grantee will be discriminated against on the basis of its religious character or affiliation, religious name, or the religious composition of its board of directors or persons working in the organization.

Financial and Government Audit Requirements

Discretionary grants are governed by the provisions of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) circulars applicable to financial assistance and the OJP's *Financial Guide* available from the OJP Web site (www.ojp.usdoj.gov/oc). The Guide includes information on allowable costs, methods of payment, audit requirements, accounting systems, and financial records. This document will govern the administration of funds by all successful applicants.

Audits of state and local units of government, institutions of higher education, and other nonprofit institutions must comply with the organizational audit requirements of OMB circular A-133, which states that recipients who expend \$500,000 or more of federal funds during their fiscal year are required to submit an organizationwide financial and compliance audit report within 9 months after the close of each fiscal year during the term of the award to their cognizant federal agency.

Grantees must comply with the following OJP reporting requirements:

- ❖ *Financial Status Reports (SF-269)*. Financial Status Reports should be completed and provided to the Office of the Comptroller's Control Desk within 45 days after the end of each calendar quarter during the grant period.
- ❖ *Categorical Assistance Progress Reports (OJP Form 4587/1)*. Categorical Assistance Progress Reports should be completed and provided to the Office of the Comptroller's Control Desk within 30 days after the end of the June 30 and December 31 semiannual reporting periods.

Services to Limited English Proficient (LEP) Persons

Recipients of Office of Justice Programs (OJP) financial assistance are required to comply with several Federal civil rights laws, including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 ("Title VI") and the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 ("Safe Streets Act"), as amended. These laws prohibit discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, and sex in the delivery of services.

National origin discrimination includes discrimination on the basis of limited English proficiency (LEP). To ensure compliance with Title VI and the Safe Streets Act, recipients are required to take reasonable steps to ensure that LEP persons have meaningful access to their programs. Meaningful access may entail providing language assistance services, including oral and written translation, where necessary.

Grantees are encouraged to consider the need for language services for LEP persons served or encountered both in developing their proposals and budgets and in conducting their programs and activities. Reasonable costs associated with providing meaningful access for LEP individuals are considered allowable program costs.

The U.S. Department of Justice has issued guidance for grantees to assist them in complying with Title VI requirements. The guidance document can be accessed on the Internet at www.lep.gov, by contacting OJP's Office for Civil Rights at 202-307-0690, or by writing to the following address: Office for Civil Rights, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, 810 7th Street, NW., 8th Floor, Washington, D.C. 20531.

Single Point of Contact Review

Executive Order 12372 requires applicants from state and local units of government or other organizations providing services within a state to submit a copy of the application to the state Single Point of Contact (SPOC) if one exists and if this program has been selected for review by the state. A list of state SPOCs is available on the Office of Management and Budget Web site (www.whitehouse.gov/omb/grants/spoc.html). Applicants must contact their state SPOCs to determine whether their programs have been selected for state review. The date that the application was sent to the SPOC or the reason such submission is not required should be entered in Block 3 of the Overview section of the GMS application.

Suspension or Termination of Funding

OJJDP may suspend funding in whole or in part, terminate funding, or impose other sanctions on a recipient for the following reasons:

- ❖ Failing to comply substantially with the requirements or statutory objectives of the appropriate Act, program guidelines issued thereunder, or other provisions of federal law.
- ❖ Failing to make satisfactory progress toward the goals, objectives or strategies set forth in the application.
- ❖ Failing to adhere to the requirements in the agreement, standard conditions, or special conditions.
- ❖ Proposing or implementing substantial plan changes to the extent that, if originally submitted, the application would not have been selected for funding.
- ❖ Failing to submit reports.
- ❖ Filing a false certification in this application or other report or document.

Before imposing sanctions, OJJDP will provide reasonable notice to the recipient of its intent to impose sanctions and will attempt informally to resolve the problem. Hearing and appeal procedures will follow those in U.S. Department of Justice regulations in 28 CFR Part 18.

Appendix B: Performance Measures

To ensure compliance with the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA), Public Law 103-62, this solicitation notifies applicants that they are required to collect and report data which measures the results of the programs implemented with this grant. To ensure accountability of this data, for which OJP is responsible, the following performance measures are provided:

- ❖ The number of sites evaluated for promising practices and policies that reduce the harmful effects of children's exposure to violence.
- ❖ The number of program sites with appropriate comparison/control groups in place in the evaluation.
- ❖ The number of matched treatment and comparison/control cases for inclusion in the data analysis.
- ❖ Percentage of annual evaluation work plan completed each year.

The award recipients will be required to collect and report data in support of these measures. The recipient's assistance in obtaining this information will facilitate future program planning and will allow OJP to provide Congress with measurable program results of federally funded programs.

Appendix C: Data That Will Be Available to the National Evaluator—Performance Measures for the Safe Start: Promising Approaches for Children Exposed to Violence Program

Sites selected to participate in the Safe Start: Promising Approaches for Children Exposed to Violence program, are required in accordance with the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA), Public Law 103–62, to collect and report data on the following performance measures:

- ❖ Number of children identified as having been exposed to violence.
- ❖ Number of families from which these identified children come.
- ❖ Number of children served.
- ❖ Number of families from which these served children come.
- ❖ Number of professionals and direct workers trained on issues related to children’s exposure to violence (if relevant to site activities).
- ❖ Number of policies developed, enhanced, or expanded to address the issue of children’s exposure to violence (if relevant to site activities).

The data collected on these performance measures will be available to the National Evaluator of the Safe Start: Promising Approaches for Children Exposed to Violence program.

Appendix D: Data That Will Be Available to the National Evaluator—Case Variables for Children Served

Sites participating in the Safe Start: Promising Approaches for Children Exposed to Violence program will be required to collect data on the following case variables (which are to be submitted twice yearly and will be available to the national evaluator).

1. The type(s) of violence the child witnessed:

- Neighborhood/community violence.
- Domestic violence against a parent or primary caretaker.
- Maltreatment of sibling.
- Maltreatment of index child.
- Violence against index child by sibling.
- Other type of violence (describe). _____

2. Severity of violence the child witnessed:

- Minor/moderate physical injury of victim.
- Minor/moderate physical injury to self.
- Severe physical injury of victim.
- Severe physical injury to self.
- Death of victim.
- Use of a weapon (type of weapon?): _____
- Did child perceive self to be at risk for injury? Yes / No
- Duration of incident (measured in minutes): _____

3. Child's relationship to persons involved:

- Relationship to victim: _____
- Relationship to perpetrator: _____

4. Age of child at exposure: _____

5. Sex of child: Male / Female

6. Race/ethnicity of child: _____

7. Length of time since index incident: _____

8. Child's proximity to violent event witnessed (measured in linear distance): _____

9. Is this the child's first exposure to violence? Yes / No

10. At intake, has child already received any intervention or treatment for this incidence of exposure?

Yes (describe) / No _____

11. Does the child display any of the following sequelae at intake (pre-intervention)? Yes / No and how measured (which instrument/scale):

- Depression.
- Developmental delay.
- School failure.
- Anti-social or delinquent behavior.
- PTSD.
- Other _____

12. Does the child display any of the following sequelae at follow-up (post-intervention)? Yes / No and how measured (which instrument/scale):

- Depression.
- Developmental delay.
- School failure.
- Anti-social or delinquent behavior.
- PTSD.
- Other _____

Appendix E: Application Checklist

Evaluation of Safe Start: Promising Approaches for Children Exposed to Violence

All applications must be submitted electronically through the Office of Justice Programs' Grants Management System (GMS).

- GMS Registration must be completed no later than May 2, 2005.
- Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) is generated by completing the Overview, Applicant Information, and Project Information screens in GMS.
- Assurances and Certifications must be reviewed and accepted online by the applicant's authorizing official.
- Budget Detail Worksheet (Attachment #1) must include a worksheet that identifies and a narrative that justifies all proposed costs.
- Program Narrative (Attachment #2) must discuss the problems to be addressed, detail the applicant's management and organizational capability, and describe the evaluation plan.
- Other Attachments (Attachments #3-6) must include the following:
 - Resumes of key personnel.
 - Timeline/milestone chart.
 - Sample informed consent forms.
 - Evidence of provisional institutional review board clearance.

Files attached to your GMS application must be submitted as a Microsoft Word document (.doc), Excel worksheet (.xls), PDF file (.pdf), or text document (.txt). *Be sure that the file name of each attachment is descriptive of its contents (e.g, the words "program narrative" should be included in the name of the file containing the program narrative).* Refer to the program announcement for detailed descriptions of these items.

Deadlines

- Applicants must register on GMS by May 2, 2005.
- Applicants must submit completed applications by 8 P.M. ET June 7, 2005.

Applications will only be accepted through the GMS online application system. Mailed or faxed applications will not be considered.

GMS: <https://grants.ojp.usdoj.gov>

GMS Help Desk: 888-549-9901
