



The U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), Office of Justice Programs (OJP), National Institute of Justice (NIJ) is pleased to announce that it is seeking applications for funding for an evaluation of the National Institute of Corrections evidence-based decision making framework for local criminal justice systems. The primary objective of the evaluation will be to assess the connections between evidence-based court decisions and supervision options that break the cycle of criminal recidivism, protect the public, and assist offenders reentering the community from incarceration. This program furthers the Department's mission by sponsoring research to provide objective, independent, evidence-based knowledge and tools to meet the challenges of crime and justice, particularly at the State and local levels.

Solicitation: Evaluation of National Institute of Corrections Evidence-Based Decision Making Framework for Local Criminal Justice Systems

Eligibility

In general, NIJ is authorized to make grants to, or enter into contracts or cooperative agreements with, States (including territories), local governments (including federally-recognized Indian tribal governments as determined by the Secretary of the Interior and published in the Federal Register), nonprofit and profit organizations (including tribal nonprofit and profit organizations), institutions of higher education (including tribal institutions of higher education), and certain qualified individuals. Foreign governments, foreign organizations, and foreign institutions of higher education are not eligible to apply.

Deadline

Registration with Grants.gov is required prior to application submission.
(See "How to Apply," page 9.)

All applications are due by **11:59 p.m. eastern time on June 7, 2010**.
(See "Deadlines: Registration and Application," page 3.)

Contact Information

For technical assistance with submitting the application, contact the Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline at 1-800-518-4726 or via e-mail to support@grants.gov.

Note: The Grants.gov Support Hotline hours of operation are 24 hours, seven days a week, except for Federal holidays.

For assistance with any other requirement of this solicitation, contact Marilyn C. Moses, Social Science Analyst, at 202-514-6205 or by e-mail to Marilyn.Moses@usdoj.gov.

Grants.Gov number assigned to announcement: **NIJ-2010-2593**

SL# 000940

CONTENTS

Overview	3
Deadlines: Registration and Application	3
Eligibility	3
Specific Information	3
Performance Measures.....	9
How to Apply.....	9
What an Application Must Include.....	11
Standard Form 424	11
Program Narrative	11
Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative	14
Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable)	14
Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable).....	14
Other Standard Forms	15
Selection Criteria.....	15
Review Process	16
Additional Requirements.....	17
Application Checklist.....	19

Evaluation of National Institute of Corrections Evidence-Based Decision Making Framework for Local Criminal Justice Systems

CFDA No. 16.560

Overview

NIJ seeks applications for an evaluation of the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) evidence-based decision making framework for local criminal justice systems. The primary objective of the evaluation will be to assess the connections between evidence-based court decisions and supervision options that break the cycle of criminal recidivism, protect the public, and assist offenders reentering the community from incarceration. One award is expected to be made to perform evaluability assessments, process evaluations, and outcome evaluations for the seed and pilot sites.

Authorizing Legislation: The Second Chance Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-199) Sec 241.

Deadlines: Registration and Application

Registration is required prior to submission. OJP strongly encourages registering with Grants.gov several weeks prior to the deadline for application submission. The deadline for applying for funding under this announcement **11:59 p.m. eastern time on June 7, 2010**. Please see the “How to Apply” section, page 9, for more details.

Eligibility

Please refer to the title page for eligibility information under this program.

Specific Information—Evaluation of National Institute of Corrections Evidence-Based Decision Making Framework for Local Criminal Justice Systems

Background

In 2008, NIC funded development of an evidence-based decision making framework for local criminal justice systems. The 18 month project resulted in *A Framework for Evidence-Based Decision Making in Local Criminal Justice Systems* (“the Framework”).¹ This document was designed to advance constructive change in local level criminal justice decision making. The Framework describes key criminal justice decisions, evidence-based knowledge about effective justice practices, and practical local level strategies for applying risk and recidivism reduction principles and techniques.

¹ The Framework can be accessed at <http://www.cepp.com/documents/EBDM%20Framework.pdf>.

A key component of the Framework is the Evidence-Based Decision Making Logic Model. The logic model addresses implementation of the Framework at the *system* level. In 2010, NIC will assist up to six seed sites in the implementation of this Framework. Two of these sites will then be selected as pilot sites for full testing and evaluation of the Framework. The sites will be at the county or city level.

NIJ, in cooperation with NIC, seeks proposals to evaluate the Framework as piloted. An important objective of the evaluation will be to assess the connections between evidence-based court decisions and supervision options that break the cycle of criminal recidivism, protect the public, and assist offenders reentering the community from incarceration to establish a self-sustaining and law-abiding life.

All evaluation proposals must include the following three components:

- Evaluability Assessment – Assessment of sites' preparedness for rigorous outcome evaluation (up to six sites).
- Process Evaluation – Assessment of the implementation of the Framework (two sites).
- Outcome Evaluation – Test of the Framework assumptions and measurement of risk and recidivism reduction, including breaking the cycle of recidivism and assessing the effectiveness of reentry initiatives (two sites).

As each component concludes, a report is to be submitted that summarizes the methods, analyses, and findings of that component, for a total of three reports. The second and third reports should build upon the preceding reports. Specific expectations for each component are described in the following sections.

Evaluability Assessment

Up to six seed sites will be competitively selected to participate in the pilot test preparation phase of the initiative. Selection of the seed sites is anticipated to be completed by September 30, 2010. Technical assistance to the seed sites is anticipated to span approximately one year, from October 2010 to October 2011. During this pilot test preparation phase, each of the seed sites will receive extensive technical assistance from NIC. With this assistance, each site will develop detailed system, agency, and case level logic models specific to the needs, resources, and operation of their specific site. These models will delineate the specific decision points, system actors, functions, roles, data systems, and operations that will be modified; linkages between modifications and outcomes; and the anticipated change in specific outcomes. The selected project evaluator will use these models along with site visits; interviews; document and data reviews; and any other necessary analytic tools to conduct evaluability assessments for each of the seed sites. At a minimum, these assessments must accomplish the following for each site:

- Determine plausibility and measurability of program goals and objectives.
- Determine site specific criteria for evaluation in each site.
- Identify composition and size of client population.
- Determine resource availability and gaps.
- Identify data sources used to measure program processes, operation, and outcomes.
- Assess quality of data sources.

Process Evaluation

Two jurisdictions will be selected to participate in the initiative's full pilot test. The pilot test period is anticipated to begin about October 2011; its anticipated duration is up to two years. These two pilot sites will be selected from the six seed sites. Selection will include, among other criteria, those most amenable to evaluation and likely to produce the desired system changes. The full pilot test will build on the capacity developed in the preparation phase to implement the Evidence-Based Decision-Making Framework.

To implement the Framework, the two pilot sites will undertake activities at the system, agency, and case levels. These activities are likely to include changes in decision making at the system level and changes in policy and practice at the agency level. At the case level, specific activities are expected to include, among others, the implementation or modification of case processing practices. These specific activities will be enumerated in the jurisdictions' logic models developed in conjunction with the technical assistance team during the pilot test preparation phase.

The process evaluation should focus on the implementation process and the outputs that occur during this phase. The evaluation proposal should include a preliminary site visit protocol listing the types and format of information to be collected. Although the specific information to be collected may vary by site to some degree, some of the following types of process information may be collected:

- List of potential interviewees by role.
- Interview guide that enumerates the topics to be covered during the site visit interviews, specific questions to be answered, and probes to elicit additional detail.
- List of archival documents sought.
- Preliminary chronology of events.
- Efforts at stakeholder collaboration.
- Articulation of roles and expectations.
- Policy changes at the system, agency, and case levels.
- Decision making process including how evidence is or will be used to guide decision making at the system, agency, and case levels.
- Analysis of service gaps and the development, implementation, or refinement of programs designed to address criminogenic needs.
- Knowledge and competencies in evidence-based decision making (EBDM).
- Validation and implementation of risk assessment tools.
- Creation of systems for information sharing, data collection, and data reporting.
- Implementation of performance measurement.
- Contextual conditions affecting implementation.
- Other data collection forms as appropriate, such as surveys to measure knowledge and skill change, data reporting forms to document program intensity/dosage/frequency of activities, etc.

The outputs to be tracked will likely be site specific, as the pilot sites define and adopt their own vision of, and goals for, the local criminal justice system and develop their own site logic models. However, it is anticipated that the evaluation will assess a number of common output measures related to the implementation of the Framework, including some of the following:

- Degree of collaboration as evidenced by the number and types of meetings, types of joint policies adopted, coordination of individual agency policies, number and types of memorandum of understanding (MOU) signed, etc.
- Degree and breadth of involvement by stakeholder agencies in the implementation process as evidenced by level of participation in stakeholder meetings.
- Appropriate use of validated risk assessments to include such indicators as:
 - Number and type of assessments conducted.
 - Deviations from assessment results.
 - Use of assessments in charging, pretrial release, plea negotiations, sentencing, and offender placement.
 - Risk level of offenders held in jail awaiting adjudication, as well as those placed in medium/high intensity supervision caseloads.
 - Sentencing recommendations as compared to results of risk assessments.
 - Placements as compared to the results of the risk assessments.
- Knowledge and competency among policymakers and line personnel regarding the use of EBDM, evidence-based practices (EBP), and risk and recidivism reduction strategies.
- Enhanced reentry efforts (increased number of completed assessments prior to release, increased number of offenders with case plans prior to release, increased number of offenders with housing prior to release, reductions in technical violations, etc.).

Outcome Evaluation

The outcome evaluation is designed to test the underlying assumptions of the Framework. Outcome measures should focus on changes at the system, agency, and case levels, as well as measures of public safety, cost, and program operations. A rigorous experimental or quasi-experimental design is required for the outcome evaluation.

The outcome evaluation should test the underlying assumptions of the Framework as delineated in the logic model's "activities":

1. The professional judgment of criminal justice system decision makers is enhanced when informed by evidence-based knowledge.
2. Every interaction within the criminal justice system offers an opportunity to contribute to recidivism reduction.
3. Systems achieve better outcomes when they operate collaboratively.
4. The criminal justice system will continually learn and improve when professionals make decisions based on the collection, analysis, and use of data and information.

A key feature of the outcome evaluation should be the analysis of risk and recidivism reduction. The specific measures of risk and recidivism reduction will be articulated by the pilot sites,² but should include at a minimum the following outcomes:

- Reductions in recidivism.
- Change in time to re-arrest.
- Cost benefits/cost effectiveness of system interventions.
- Changes in public satisfaction with the criminal justice system.
- Changes in public health and welfare such as jail admissions for mental health issues, emergency room admissions for crime-related illness/injury, child support enforcement, etc.
- Changes in justice system administration such as caseloads, use of incarceration, case processing times, etc.

NIJ recognizes the challenge of developing a detailed research design in the absence of more specific information about the program activities being implemented and the sites to be selected for evaluation. Once the evaluation awardee has been selected, the evaluator will work with NIJ and NIC to prepare a finalized evaluation plan that operationalizes the Framework's assumptions, describes the overall methods, units of analyses and sample sizes as appropriate, as well as the independent and dependent variables, control variables, and the analysis plan. It is anticipated that data will be collected at the system, agency, and case level.

Amount and length of awards: NIJ anticipates that up to a total of \$750,000 may become available for an award made through this solicitation. **All NIJ awards are subject to the availability of appropriated funds and to any modifications or additional requirements that may be imposed by law.** In order to adequately test the Framework's assumptions, the evaluation period should allow for sufficient time to fully implement the Framework, realize outcomes, and sustain change. As such, it is anticipated that the award period will be for three years.

A grant made by NIJ under this solicitation may account for up to 100 percent of the total cost of the project. See "Cofunding" under "What an Application Must Include."

Evaluation Research: Within applications proposing evaluation research, funding priority will be given to experimental research designs that use random selection and assignment of participants to experimental and control conditions. When randomized designs are not feasible, priority will be given to quasi-experimental designs that include contemporary procedures like Propensity Score Matching and Regression Discontinuity Design to address selection bias in evaluating outcomes and impacts.

Evaluations that also include measurements of program fidelity and implementation as part of a thorough process assessment are desirable. Measurements of program fidelity should be included as part of an assessment of program processes and operations to ensure that policies, programs, and technologies are implemented as designed. As one aspect of a comprehensive evaluation, assessments of program processes should include objective measurements and qualitative observations of programs as they are actually implemented and services are

² See *A Framework for Evidence-Based Decision in Local Criminal Justice Systems* for specific measures that may be used to assess these outcomes (<http://www.cepp.com/documents/EBDM%20Framework.pdf>).

delivered. These may include assessment of such aspects as adherence to program content and protocol, quantity and duration, quality of delivery, and participant responsiveness.

Proposed evaluation research designs with multiple units of analysis and multiple measurements will also be given priority. Design aspects that contribute to the validity of results are necessary to effectively address issues of generalizability and representativeness of findings.

Finally, applications that include cost/benefit analysis will be given priority. NIJ views cost/benefit analysis as an effective way to communicate and disseminate findings from evaluation research.

Please note: All applicants under this solicitation must comply with Department of Justice regulations on confidentiality and human subjects protection. See “Other Requirements for OJP Applications” at http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/other_requirements.htm.

What will *not* be funded:

1. Provision of training or direct service.
2. Proposals primarily to purchase equipment, materials, or supplies. (Your budget may include these items if they are necessary to conduct applied research, development, demonstration, evaluation, or analysis.)
3. Work that will be funded under another specific solicitation.

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, Federal funds may not be used to pay total cash compensation (salary plus bonuses) to any employee of the award recipient at a rate that exceeds 110% 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 2010 salary table for SES employees is available at <http://www.opm.gov/oca/10tables/indexSES.asp>.) Note: A recipient may compensate an employee at a higher 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 limitation on compensation rates allowable under an award may be waived on an individual basis at the discretion of the Director of the National Institute of Justice. An applicant that wishes to request a waiver must include a detailed justification in the budget narrative of its application. Unless the applicant submits a waiver request and justification with the application, the applicant should anticipate that OJP will request that the applicant adjust and resubmit its budget.

The justification should include: the particular qualifications and expertise of the individual, the uniqueness of the service being provided, 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 that is to be done.

Performance Measures

To assist in fulfilling the Department’s responsibilities under the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA), P.L. 103-62, applicants who receive funding under this solicitation must provide data that measure the results of their work. Applicants who receive funding under this solicitation are required 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>Develop and analyze information and data having clear implications for criminal justice policy and practice in the United States.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Relevance to the needs of the field as measured by whether the grantee’s substantive scope did not deviate from the funded proposal or any subsequent agency modifications to the scope. 2. Quality of the research as assessed by peer reviewers. 3. Quality of management as measured by whether significant interim project milestones were achieved, final deadlines were met, and costs remained within approved limits. 4. If applicable, number of NIJ final grant reports, NIJ research documents, and grantee research documents published. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A final report providing a comprehensive overview of the project and a detailed description of the project design, data, and methods; a full presentation of scientific findings; and a thorough discussion of the implications of the project findings for criminal justice practice and policy in the United States. 2. Quarterly financial reports, semi-annual progress reports, and a final progress report. 3. If applicable, each data set that was collected, acquired, or modified in conjunction with the project. 4. If applicable, citation to report(s)/document(s).

How to Apply

Applications will be submitted through Grants.gov. Grants.gov is a “one-stop storefront” that provides a unified process for all customers of Federal grants to find funding opportunities and apply for funding. Complete instructions on how to register and submit an application can be found at www.grants.gov. If you experience difficulties at any point during this process, please call the Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline at 1–800–518–4726, 24 hours, seven days a week, except for Federal holidays. Registering with Grants.gov is a one-time process; however, **processing delays may occur and it can take up to several weeks** for first-time registrants to receive confirmation and a user password. OJP highly recommends that applicants start the registration process as early as possible to prevent delays in submitting an application package by the application deadline specified.

All applicants are required to complete the following steps.

1. **Acquire a DUNS Number.** A DUNS number is required for [Grants.gov](http://www.grants.gov) registration. The Office of Management and Budget requires that all businesses and nonprofit applicants for Federal funds include a DUNS (Data Universal Numbering System) number in their applications for a new award or renewal of an existing award. A DUNS number is a

unique nine-digit sequence recognized as the universal standard for identifying and keeping track of 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. Obtain a DUNS number by calling 1–866–705–5711 or by applying online at www.dunandbradstreet.com. Individuals are exempt from this requirement.

2. **Acquire or Renew Registration With the Central Contractor Registration (CCR) Database.** OJP requires that all applicants (other than individuals) for Federal financial assistance maintain current registrations in the Central Contractor Registration (CCR) database. An applicant must be registered in the CCR to successfully register in Grants.gov. The CCR database is the repository for standard information about Federal financial assistance applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. Organizations that have previously submitted applications via Grants.gov are already registered with CCR, as it is a requirement for Grants.gov registration. Please note, however, that applicants must update or renew their CCR registration at least once per year to maintain an active status. Information about CCR registration procedures can be accessed at www.ccr.gov.
3. **Acquire an Authorized Organization Representative (AOR) and a Grants.gov Username and Password.** Complete your AOR profile on Grants.gov and create your username and password. You will need to use your organization's DUNS Number to complete this step. For more information about the registration process, go to www.grants.gov/applicants/get_registered.jsp.
4. **Acquire Authorization for Your AOR From the E-Business Point of Contact (E-Biz POC).** The E-Biz POC at your organization must login to Grants.gov to confirm you as an AOR. Please note that there can be more than one AOR for your organization.
5. **Search for the Funding Opportunity on Grants.gov.** Please use the following identifying information when searching for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov. The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number for this solicitation is 16.560, titled "*National Institute of Justice Research, Evaluation, and Development Projects Grants*," and the funding opportunity number is NIJ–2010–2593.
6. **Submit an Application Consistent With This Solicitation.** Within 24–48 hours after submitting your electronic application, you should receive an e-mail validation message from Grants.gov. The validation message will tell you whether the application has been received and validated or rejected, with an explanation. **Important:** You are urged to submit your application at least 72 hours prior to the due date of the application to allow time to receive the validation message and to correct any problems that may have caused a rejection notification.

Note: Grants.gov will forward the application to OJP's Grants Management System (GMS). GMS does not accept executable file types as application attachments. These disallowed file types include, but are not limited to, the following extensions: ".com," ".bat," ".exe," ".vbs," ".cfg," ".dat," ".db," ".dbf," ".dll," ".ini," ".log," ".ora," ".sys," and ".zip."

Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues

If you experience unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond your control that prevent you from submitting your application by the deadline, you must contact the NIJ staff member listed on the title page within **24 hours after the deadline** and request approval to submit your application. At that time, NIJ staff will require you to e-mail the complete grant application, your DUNS number, and provide a Grants.gov Help Desk tracking number(s). After the program office reviews all of the information submitted, and contacts the Grants.gov Help Desk to validate the technical issues you reported, OJP will contact you to either approve or deny your request to submit a late application. If the technical issues you reported cannot be validated, your application will be rejected as untimely.

To ensure a fair competition for limited discretionary funds, the following conditions are not valid reasons to permit late submissions: (1) failure to begin the registration process in sufficient time; (2) failure to follow Grants.gov instructions on how to register and apply as posted on its Web site; (3) failure to follow all of the instructions in the OJP solicitation; and (4) technical issues experienced with the applicant's computer or information technology (IT) environment.

Notifications regarding known technical problems with Grants.gov are posted on the OJP funding Web page, www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/solicitations.htm.

What an Application Must Include

This section describes what an application is expected to include and sets out a number of elements. Applicants should anticipate that failure to submit an application that contains all of the specified elements may negatively affect the review of the application and, should a decision nevertheless be made to make an award, may result in the inclusion of special conditions that preclude access to or use of award funds pending satisfaction of the conditions.

Moreover, applicants should anticipate that applications that are not responsive to the scope of the solicitation, or do not include a program narrative, budget detail worksheet, budget narrative, tribal resolution (if applicable), and resumes/curriculum vitae of key personnel will not proceed to peer review and will not receive further consideration.

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

Standard Form 424

Please see www07.grants.gov/assets/SF424Instructions.pdf for instructions on how to complete your SF424. When selecting "type of applicant," if the applicant is a for-profit entity, please select "For-Profit Organization" or "Small Business" (as applicable) in the Type of Applicant 1 data field. For-profit applicants also may select additional applicable categories (e.g., "Private Institution of Higher Education").

Program Narrative

Program Narrative Guidelines:

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

The title page should include the title of the project, submission date, funding opportunity number, and the applicant's name and complete contact information (i.e., name, address, telephone number, and e-mail address).

- b. **Project Abstract** (not counted against the 30-page program narrative limit). The 400 to 600-word abstract should state the problem under investigation (including research goals and objectives) and the anticipated relevance of the project to criminal justice public policy, practice, or theory. It should describe the proposed method and/or research design, including data to be used in addressing research questions, data collection procedures and instrumentation, access to data, and other methods or procedures of the proposed study. It should also describe procedures for data analysis and all expected products, including interim and final reports, instrumentation, and devices. If applicable, it should describe the subjects who will be involved in the proposed project, including the number of participants; participants' age, gender, and race/ethnicity; and other pertinent characteristics, such as methods used to gain access to subjects.
- c. **Resubmit Response** (if applicable). If an applicant is resubmitting a proposal that was presented previously to NIJ, but not funded, the applicant must indicate this. A two-page document addressing the previous consensus review must be provided that covers the following: (1) the title, submission date, and NIJ-assigned application number of the previous proposal, and (2) a brief summary of responses to the peer review and/or revisions to the proposal. This document should be inserted after the abstract. This document will not be counted against the 30-page program narrative limit.
- d. **Table of Contents and Figures** (not counted against the 30-page program narrative limit).
- e. **Main body.** The main body of the Program Narrative should describe the project in depth and include the following sections:
 - Purpose, goals, and objectives.
 - Review of relevant literature.
 - Detailed description of research design and methods to include: research questions, hypotheses, description of sample, analysis plan, etc.
 - Research independence and integrity (see "Selection Criteria," below).
 - Implications for criminal justice policy and practice in the United States.
 - Management plan and organization.
 - Dissemination strategy.

The program narrative section of your application must not exceed 30 double-spaced pages in 12-point font with 1-inch margins. Abstract, table of contents, charts, figures, appendices, and government forms do not count toward the 30-page limit for the narrative section.

Applicants should anticipate that if the program narrative fails to comply with these length-related restrictions, such that it provides a significant competitive advantage, the failure to comply may be considered in peer review and in final award decisions.

- f. **Appendices** (not counted against program narrative page limit) include:
- Bibliography/references.
 - Any tools/instruments, questionnaires, tables/charts/graphs, or maps pertaining to the proposed study.
 - Curriculum vitae, resumes or biographical sketches of all key personnel.
 - Project timeline and research calendar with expected milestones.
 - Human Subjects Protection Paperwork including Institutional Review Board (IRB) documentation and forms (see <http://www.ojp.gov/nij/funding/humansubjects/human-subjects.htm>).
 - Privacy Certificate (for further guidance go to <http://www.ojp.gov/nij/funding/humansubjects/privacy-certificate-guidance.htm>).
 - List of previous and current NIJ awards to applicant organization and investigator(s).
 - Letters of cooperation/support or administrative agreements from organizations collaborating in the project, such as law enforcement and correctional agencies (if applicable).
 - List of other agencies, organizations, or funding sources to which you have submitted this proposal (if applicable).
 - Other materials specified by the solicitation.
 - Data Archiving Strategy (see descriptive paragraph below).

Data Archiving Strategy

NIJ requires that each data set resulting from funded research be submitted as a grant product or deliverable for archiving with the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data. (Data sets are to be submitted 90 days before the end of the project period.) Applications for NIJ research grants must include a brief (one- or two-page) data archiving strategy. For purposes of research replication and extension, the inclusion of only the final data set often prevents other researchers from replicating or extending the study because there are no original data, intermediate data, or documentation detailing how the data changed throughout the project. This data archiving strategy therefore must briefly describe the—

- Anticipated manipulations of original, intermediate, and final data sets (as applicable).
- Methods of documentation of such manipulations.
- Preparation of original, intermediate, and final data sets for archive submission.

The data archiving strategy should be submitted as an appendix to the application and will not count toward the 30-page limit. Please label this appendix “Data Archiving Strategy.”

Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative

a. Budget Detail Worksheet

A sample Budget Detail Worksheet can be found at www.ojp.gov/funding/forms/budget_detail.pdf. If the budget is submitted in a different format, the budget categories listed in the sample budget worksheet must be included.

For questions pertaining to budget and examples of allowable and unallowable costs, please see the OJP Financial Guide at www.ojp.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. The narrative should be mathematically sound and correspond with the information and figures provided in the Budget Detail Worksheet. The narrative should explain how all costs were estimated and calculated and how they are relevant to the completion of the proposed project. The narrative may include tables for clarification purposes and can be provided in a Microsoft Office Word document. As with the Budget Detail Worksheet, the Budget Narrative must be broken down by year.

Cofunding: A grant made by NIJ under this solicitation may account for up to 100 percent of the total cost of the project. You must indicate whether you believe it is feasible for you to contribute cash, facilities, or services as non-Federal support for the project. Your application should identify generally any such contributions that you expect to make and your proposed budget should indicate in detail which items, if any, will be supported with non-Federal contributions.

Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable)

Applicants that do not have a federally negotiated indirect cost rate and wish to establish one can submit a proposal to their "cognizant" Federal agency. Generally, the cognizant Federal agency is the agency that provides the preponderance of direct Federal funding. This can be determined by reviewing an organization's schedule of Federal financial assistance. If DOJ is your cognizant Federal agency, obtain information needed to submit an indirect cost rate proposal at <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/financialguide/part3/part3chap17.htm>.

Tribal Authorizing Resolution

If an application is being submitted by either (1) a tribe or tribal organization, or (2) by a third party proposing to provide direct services or assistance to residents on tribal lands, then a current authorizing resolution of the governing body of the tribal entity or other enactment of the tribal council or comparable governing body authorizing the inclusion of the tribe or tribal organization and its residents must be included with the application. In those instances when an organization or consortium of tribes proposes to apply for a grant on behalf of a tribe or multiple specific tribes, then the application must include a resolution from all tribes that will be included as a part of the services/assistance provided under the grant.

Other Standard Forms

Additional forms that may be required in connection with an award are available on OJP's funding page at <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/forms.htm>. Please note in particular the following forms.

1. [Certifications Regarding Lobbying; Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters; and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements](#) (required to be submitted in GMS prior to the receipt of any award funds)
2. [Disclosure of Lobbying Activities](#) (required for any applicant that expends any funds for lobbying activities)
3. [Accounting System and Financial Capability Questionnaire](#) (required for any applicant that is a nongovernmental entity and that has not received any award from OJP within the past 3 years)
4. [Standard Assurances](#) (required to be submitted in GMS prior to the receipt of any award funds)

Note: Attachments to the application should be included in one of the following four categories: 1) Program Narrative; 2) Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative; 3) Appendices; and 4) Other.

Selection Criteria

Statement of the Problem (Understanding of the problem and its importance)—15%

Project/Program Design and Implementation (Quality and technical merit)—25%

1. Awareness of the state of current research or technology.
2. Soundness of methodology and analytic and technical approach.
3. Feasibility of proposed project and awareness of pitfalls.
4. Innovation and creativity (when appropriate).

Capabilities/Competencies (Capabilities, demonstrated productivity, and experience of applicants)—25%

1. Qualifications and experience of proposed staff.
2. Demonstrated ability of proposed staff and organization to manage the effort.
3. Adequacy of the plan to manage the project, including how various tasks are subdivided and resources are used.
4. Successful past performance on NIJ grants and contracts (when applicable).

Budget—15%

1. Total cost of the project relative to the perceived benefit.
2. Appropriateness of the budget relative to the level of effort.
3. Use of existing resources to conserve costs.

Impact/Outcomes and Evaluation (Relevance to policy and practice)—15%

1. Potential for significant advances in scientific or technical understanding of the problem.
2. Potential for significant advances in the field.
3. Relevance for improving the policy and practice of criminal justice and related agencies in the United States and improving public safety, security, and quality of life.
4. Affordability and cost-effectiveness of proposed end products, when applicable (e.g., purchase price and maintenance costs for a new technology or cost of training to use the technology).
5. Perceived potential for commercialization and/or implementation of a new technology (when applicable).

Relevance of the project for policy and practice in the United States

Higher quality applications clearly explain the practical implications of the project. They connect technical expertise with criminal justice policy and practice. To ensure that the project has strong relevance for policy and practice, some researchers and technologists collaborate with practitioners and policymakers. You may include letters showing support from practitioners, but they carry less weight than clear evidence that you understand why policymakers and practitioners would benefit from your work and how they would use it. While a partnership may affect State or local activities, it should also have broader implications for others across the country.

Dissemination Strategy—5%

1. Well-defined plan for the grant recipient to disseminate results to appropriate audiences, including researchers, practitioners, and policymakers.
2. Suggestions for print and electronic products NIJ might develop for practitioners and policymakers.

Research Independence and Integrity

Regardless of a proposal's rating under the criteria outlined above, in order to receive funds, the applicant's proposal must demonstrate research independence, including appropriate safeguards to ensure research objectivity and integrity.

Considerations in evaluating research 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/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.

Review Process

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

Peer reviewers will be reviewing the applications submitted under this solicitation that meet basic minimum requirements. NIJ may use either internal peer reviewers, external peer reviewers, or a combination to review the applications under this solicitation. An external peer reviewer is an expert in the field of the subject matter of a given solicitation who is NOT a current U.S. Department of Justice employee. An internal reviewer is a current U.S. Department

of Justice employee who is well-versed or has expertise in the subject matter of this solicitation. Eligible applications will be evaluated, scored, and rated by a peer review panel. 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.

The Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO), in consultation with NIJ, conducts a financial review of applications for potential discretionary awards and cooperative agreements to evaluate the fiscal integrity and financial capability of applicants; examines proposed costs to determine if the budget and budget narrative accurately explain project costs; and determines whether costs are reasonable, necessary, and allowable under applicable Federal cost principles and agency regulations.

All final award decisions will be made by the Director of the National Institute of Justice, who also may give consideration to 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. We strongly encourage you to review the information pertaining to these additional requirements prior to submitting your application. Additional information for each can be found at http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/other_requirements.htm.

- Civil Rights Compliance
- Faith-Based and Other Community Organizations
- Confidentiality and Human Subjects Protection (if applicable)
- Anti-Lobbying Act
- Financial and Government Audit Requirements
- National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (if applicable)
- DOJ Information Technology Standards (if applicable)
- Single Point of Contact Review
- Nonsupplanting of State or Local Funds
- Criminal Penalty for False Statements
- Compliance with [Office of Justice Programs Financial Guide](#)
- Suspension or Termination of Funding

- Nonprofit Organizations
- For-Profit Organizations
- Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA)
- Rights in Intellectual Property
- Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA) of 2006
- Awards in excess of \$5,000,000 – Federal taxes certification requirement

If your proposal is funded, you will be required to submit several reports and other materials, including:

Final substantive report: The final report should be a comprehensive overview of the project and should include a detailed description of the project design, data, and methods; a full presentation of scientific findings; a thorough discussion of the implications of the project findings for criminal justice practice and policy in the United States; etc. It must contain an abstract of no more than 600 words and an executive summary of 2,500 to 4,000 words.

A draft of the final report, abstract, and executive summary must be submitted 90 days before the end date of the grant. The draft final report will be peer reviewed upon submission. The reviews will be forwarded to the principal investigator with suggestions for revisions. The author must then submit the revised final report, abstract, and executive summary by the end date of the grant. The abstract, executive summary, and final report must be submitted in both paper and electronic formats.

For program evaluation studies, the final report should include a section on measuring program performance. This section should outline the measures used to evaluate program effectiveness, modifications made to those measures as a result of the evaluation, and recommendations regarding these and other potential performance measures for similar programs. (This information will be particularly valuable to NIJ and other Federal program agencies in implementing performance measures for federally funded criminal justice programs.)

Interim reports: Grantees must submit quarterly financial reports, semi-annual progress reports, a final progress report, and, if applicable, an annual audit report in accordance with Office of Management and Budget Circular A-133. Future awards and fund drawdowns may be withheld if reports are delinquent.

Data sets: NIJ requires submission of all data sets (original, intermediate, and final) produced or collected for the funded project, and any artifact associated with the project data. Included with the final sets of data should be the plan outlined in the Data Archiving Strategy section of the proposal.

Application Checklist

Evaluation of National Institute of Corrections Evidence-Based Decision Making Framework for Local Criminal Justice Systems

The application checklist has been created to aid you in developing your application.

Eligibility Requirement:

_____ Tribal authorizing resolution (if applicable)

Application Components:

_____ Program Narrative (see pages 11–13 and “Selection Criteria,” pages 15–16)

_____ Appendices to the Program Narrative

_____ Bibliography/References

_____ Any tools/instruments, questionnaires, tables/charts/graphs, or maps pertaining to the proposed study

_____ Curriculum vitae, resumes or biographical sketches of all key personnel

_____ Project timeline and research calendar with expected milestones

_____ Human Subjects Protection Paperwork

_____ Privacy Certificate

_____ List of previous and current NIJ awards to applicant organization and investigators

_____ Letters of cooperation/support or administrative agreements from organizations collaborating in the project (if applicable)

_____ List of other agencies, organizations, or funding sources to which you have submitted this proposal (if applicable)

_____ Data Archiving Strategy

_____ Budget Narrative

_____ Budget Detail Worksheet

_____ Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable)

Program Narrative/Abstract Format:

_____ Double-spaced

_____ 12-point standard font

_____ 1” standard margins

_____ Narrative is 30 pages or less

Other:

_____ Standard Form 424

_____ DUNS number

_____ Other standard forms as applicable (see page 15), including

_____ Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (if applicable)

_____ Accounting System and Financial Capability Questionnaire (if applicable)