



The [U.S. Department of Justice](#) (DOJ), [Office of Justice Programs](#) (OJP), [National Institute of Justice](#) (NIJ) is seeking applications for basic research in the development and validation of a risk assessment tool with both static and dynamic factors designed for use in criminal and juvenile justice systems to estimate the short-term risk that juveniles with a history of sex offenses may recommit sex offenses. 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.

Basic Scientific Research to Assess Youth With Sexual Offending Behavior

Eligibility

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

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

Deadline

Applicants must register with [Grants.gov](#) prior to submitting an application. (See "How to Apply," page 23.) All applications are due by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on **June 24, 2013**. (See "Deadlines: Registration and Application," page 3.)

Contact Information

For technical assistance with submitting an application, contact the Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline at 800-518-4726 or 606-545-5035, or via e-mail to support@grants.gov.

Note: The [Grants.gov](#) Support Hotline hours of operation are 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, except federal holidays.

For assistance with any other requirements of this solicitation, contact Dr. Marie Garcia, Social Science Analyst, by telephone at 202-514-7128, or by e-mail at Marie.Garcia@usdoj.gov.

Grants.gov number assigned to this announcement: NIJ-2013-3614

Release date: April 25, 2013

SL001077

Contents

Overview.....	3
Deadlines: Registration and Application.....	3
Eligibility.....	3
Program-Specific Information.....	3
Performance Measures.....	9
Notice of Post-Award FFATA Reporting Requirement.....	10
What an Application Should Include.....	11
Information to Complete the Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424).....	11
Abstract.....	11
Program Narrative.....	13
Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative.....	16
Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable).....	17
Additional Attachments (if applicable).....	17
Other Standard Forms.....	19
Selection Criteria.....	19
Review Process.....	21
Additional Requirements.....	21
How to Apply.....	23
Provide Feedback to OJP on This Solicitation.....	26
Application Checklist.....	27

Basic Scientific Research to Assess Youth With Sexual Offending Behavior (CFDA No. 16.560)

Overview

As part of a collaborative effort with and funding from the Office of Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering, and Tracking (SMART), the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) seeks applications for funding basic scientific research in the development and validation of a risk assessment tool with both static and dynamic factors designed for use in criminal and juvenile justice systems to estimate the short-term risk that juveniles with a history of sex offenses may recommit sex offenses. This program furthers the SMART Office's mission to identify, promote and support best practices in the field of sex offender management. The risk assessment tool can (a) be available in the field of juvenile justice currently but not validated empirically; or (b) be developed for the purposes of this solicitation. The risk assessment tool should be validated in up to four sites that are geographically and demographically diverse, should include protective factors, and should be capable of estimating short-term risk of reoffending no more than 1 to 3 years into the future for juvenile sex offenders.

Authorizing Legislation: The Adam Walsh Act (AWA), 42 USC §§ 16901, *et seq*; Pub. L. No. 113-6, 127 Stat. 198, 254.

Deadlines: Registration and Application

Applicants must register with Grants.gov in order to submit an application. OJP encourages applicants to **register several weeks before** the application submission deadline. In addition, OJP urges applicants to submit applications 72 hours prior to the application due date. The deadline to apply for funding under this announcement is 11:59 p.m. eastern time on **June 24, 2013**. See "How to Apply" on page 23 for details.

Eligibility

Refer to the title page for eligibility under this program.

Project-Specific Information

Risk assessment has evolved from a process that once was based primarily upon clinical judgment to more modern approaches that incorporate scientifically tested, actuarial measures. These modern approaches provide a more accurate picture of risk and needs as they rely on objective and empirically validated information rather than the subjective insight of an individual. As a result, criminal justice professionals have more tools to develop targeted supervision and treatment strategies for sex offenders. These approaches can benefit jurisdictions through better allocation of scarce resources and can increase public safety by targeting the highest risk individuals to receive increased and intensive treatment and supervision.

Knowledge of the accuracy and efficacy of risk assessment tools continues to grow. In 2008, the SMART Office and NIJ funded an evaluation of two adult risk assessments tools, Sex Offender Treatment Intervention and Progress Scale (SOTIPS) and the Static-99R, to determine whether the combined use of these tools would result in more accurate risk predictions in the State of Vermont. Results showed that the combined use of these tools improved risk prediction accuracy more than either tool used alone.¹ In 2012, SMART and NIJ funded a replication and evaluation of this model in two additional jurisdictions. This solicitation seeks to improve knowledge of and the accuracy and efficacy of risk assessment tools in the field of juvenile justice, as there is currently a dearth of knowledge on static and dynamic risk assessments for juveniles who commit sex offenses.

Risk assessments are an important strategy for managing juveniles adjudicated as being delinquent for sexual offenses. Further, they may inform sentencing decisions, correctional programming, juvenile reentry, and post-incarceration supervision and treatment plans. However, there are few actuarial risk assessments available to estimate short-term risk (1 to 3 years) of reoffending for juveniles.

The two most common risk assessment instruments used to estimate the risk of reoffending for juveniles who commit sex offenses in the United States are the Juvenile Sex Offender Assessment Protocol-II (J-SOAP-II) and the Estimate of Risk of Adolescent Sexual Offense Recidivism (ERASOR). Both instruments are designed for clinical assessment. The actuarial assessment instrument currently available for use with juveniles who commit sexual offenses is the Juvenile Sexual Offense Recidivism Risk Assessment Tool-II (JSORRAT-II), an assessment instrument that includes only static risk factors.

Although some empirical support for the predictive validity of the J-SOAP-II, the ERASOR, and the JSORRAT-II can be found in the literature, the instruments do not perform in a manner that suggests or shows their ability to predict juvenile sexual recidivism accurately.² There is a lack of consistent, independently corroborated empirical evidence concerning both the inter-rater reliability and predictive validity of juvenile risk assessments available for use at this time, making it difficult to conclude with any degree of confidence that the instruments are scientifically valid.³

¹ To learn more about the NIJ-funded SOTIPS study, “A Model of Static and Dynamic Sex Offender Risk Assessment,” please see <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/236217.pdf>.

² Caldwell, M. F., & Dickinson, C. (2009). Sex offender registration and recidivism risk in juvenile sexual offenders. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 27(6), 941-956; Knight, R. A., Ronis, S. T., & Zakireh, B. (2009). Bootstrapping persistence risk indicators for juveniles who sexually offend. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 27, 878-909; Viljoen, J. L., Elkovitch, N., Scalora, M. J., & Ullman, D. (2009). Assessment of reoffense risk in adolescents who have committed sexual offenses: Predictive validity of the ERASOR, PCL:YV, YLS/CMI, and Static-99. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 36(10), 981-1000; Vitacco, M. J., Viljoen, J., & Petrila, J. (2009). Introduction to this Issue: Adolescent sexual offending. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 27(6), 857-861.

³ Viljoen, J. L., Mordell, S., & Beneteau, J. L. (2012). Prediction of adolescent sexual reoffending: A meta-analysis of the J-SOAP-II, ERASOR, J-SORRAT-II, and Static-99. *Law & Human Behavior*, 36(5), 423-438.

Most juvenile assessment instruments contain only risk factors, static and dynamic; however, researchers have described the mitigating effects that protective factors⁴ can have on risk. These effects have direct implications for programming to reduce violent recidivism, as both risk and protective factors should be targets of intervention and treatment efforts.⁵ Despite the apparent importance of protective factors, few of the instruments commonly used with juveniles incorporate protective factors, and those that do either have no empirical support or are in development and have not been validated empirically.⁶ Participants in the SMART Office's 2012 Sex Offender Management Assessment and Planning Initiative (SOMAPI) forum⁷ recommended that protective factors be incorporated into juvenile risk assessment instruments, both those currently in use and those that will be developed.

In addition to including protective factors, juvenile risk assessment instruments and processes need to focus on estimates of short-term rather than long-term risk.⁸ Participants in the SOMAPI forum, as well as respondents to the National Criminal Justice Association's (NCJA) national survey of sex offender management experts,⁹ expressed concern that estimates of risk more than 1 to 3 years into the future are unlikely to account sufficiently for the fluid nature of child and adolescent development.

With this solicitation, NIJ seeks applications for funding basic scientific research in the development and validation of a static and dynamic risk assessment tool for juveniles who commit sex offenses designed for use in criminal and juvenile justice systems.

⁴ Protective factors are preexisting personal characteristics or environmental conditions that increase or reduce the likelihood of delinquent behavior or other negative outcomes. See <http://www.crimesolutions.gov/TopicDetails.aspx?ID=69>.

⁵ Lodewijks, H. P. B., de Ruiter, C., & Doreleijers, T. A. (2010). The impact of protective factors in desistance from violent reoffending: A study in three samples of adolescent offenders. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25*, 568-587; Stouthamer-Loeber, M., Loeber, R., Wei, E., Farrington, D. P., & Wikström, P.O.H. (2002). Risk and promotive effects in the explanation of persistent serious delinquency in boys. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 70*(1), 111-123.

⁶ Worling, J. R., Bookalam, D., & Litteljohn, A. (2012). Prospective validity of the Estimate of Risk of Adolescent Sexual Offense Recidivism (ERASOR). *Journal of Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 24*(3), 203-223.

⁷ In February 2012, approximately 70 experts in the field of sex offender management gathered in Washington, D.C., to develop recommendations and provide guidance to the Office of Justice Programs and the SMART Office regarding future sex offender management policy, research, and grant-making efforts.

⁸ Vitacco, M. J., Caldwell, M., Ryba, N. L., Malesky, A., & Kurus, S. J. (2009). Assessing risk in adolescent sexual offenders: Recommendations for clinical practice. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 27*(6), 929-940. See also Fanniff, A. M., & Letourneau, E. J. (2012). Another piece of the puzzle: Psychometric properties of the J-SOAP-II. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 24*(4), 378-408.

⁹ The NCJA completed the 2012 Inventory of Promising or Effective Programs in Sex Offender Management using a national survey of 217 sex offender management professionals. This work was funded by the SMART Office (award 2010-DB-BX-K086).

The project objectives are to:

- Validate a risk assessment tool that incorporates static, dynamic, and protective factors, and estimates short-term rather than long-term risk that juveniles with a history of sex offenses may recommit sex offenses.
- Examine the utility of incorporating protective factors into risk assessment instruments for measuring the risk that juveniles with a history of sex offenses may recommit sex offenses.
- Produce a reliable and valid set of risk and protective factors for sexually offending behavior, and provide empirical evidence concerning both the inter-rater reliability and predictive validity of juvenile assessments for sexually offending behavior.

Applicants may validate a risk assessment tool currently available in the field or develop a tool for the purposes of this solicitation. A justification for the tool selected should be made and included in the proposal.

Site Selection

The risk assessment tool should be validated in up to four sites that are geographically and demographically diverse. The sites should have a minimum of 300-500 youth that can be included in the project. The applicant should provide evidence of the sites' case flow and juvenile sex offender population. The sites should have automated data and information systems in place capable of tracking juvenile offenders in the study. Evidence of these data systems and their capabilities should be described in the application. Applicants may include financial incentives in their proposed project budgets to encourage site participation. The sites selected to participate in the project will not receive external funding from the SMART Office or NIJ.

Applicants are encouraged to include a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or Letter of Intent from each site detailing their commitment to participate in the project in their submitted application. This document should be provided to NIJ before an award is made. A special condition will be attached to the award stipulating that the grantee may not obligate, expend, or drawdown any project funds until NIJ has received an MOU or Letter of Intent from the participating sites.

The selected grantee will be responsible for the following activities:

- Work collaboratively with the selected sites to track the implementation of the risk assessment tool selected or developed for this project.
- Verify the data infrastructure and data collection capabilities of the selected sites, and provide training on data-related issues, if applicable.
- Report and disseminate interim and final project results.

Project Deliverables and Other Project Activities

The following deliverables will be submitted to NIJ at the end of the project period:

- A final report and an executive summary that details (1) the development or modification and validation of the risk assessment tool, (2) significant findings, (3) any significant

policy implications and lessons learned, and (4) a general description of the methods used and activities performed.

- A copy of the risk assessment tool developed for the purposes of the project or the existing tool implemented and validated for the project as well as all corresponding and relevant materials.

Applicants are encouraged to submit a copy of the tool to be used for this project if it has been developed or is in use at the time of application.

Other expected deliverables for this project include:

- Bi-weekly conference calls with the NIJ program manager to review progress and address issues.
- Monthly progress reports to keep NIJ apprised of the current status of the project. Additional information about the content of the progress reports and their due dates will be provided once an award is made.
- A final progress report and a task activity summary will be submitted at the end of the performance period. The task activity summary shall address activities undertaken to achieve completion of this project.
- Data sets resulting from this research will be submitted as a product or deliverable for archiving, if applicable.

Evidence-based Programs or Practices

OJP places a strong emphasis on the use of data and evidence in policymaking and program development in criminal justice. OJP is committed to:

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

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

Amount and Length of Awards:

NIJ anticipates that up to a total of \$1 million may become available for one award made through this solicitation. **All awards are subject to the availability of appropriated funds and**

to any modifications or additional requirements that may be imposed by law. NIJ funding for an individual research project rarely exceeds \$500,000, though total funding for projects requiring multiple years to complete has exceeded \$1 million in some cases. Applicants should be aware that the total period for an award ordinarily will not exceed 3 years. FY 2013 award announcements are expected to be made by September 30, 2013. Applicants should propose a project start date that commences on January 1, 2014.

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 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.
4. Proposals that do not contain a research component or do not respond to the specific goals of this 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, recipients may not use federal funds to pay total cash compensation (salary plus cash bonuses) to any employee of the award recipient at a rate that exceeds 110% 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 2013 salary table for SES employees is available at www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/pay-leave/salaries-wages/2013/executive-senior-level. Note: A recipient may compensate an employee at a greater rate, provided the amount in excess of this compensation limitation is paid with non-federal funds. (Any such additional compensation will not be considered matching funds where match requirements apply.)

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

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

Minimization of Conference Costs

OJP encourages applicants to review the OJP guidance on conference approval, planning, and reporting that is available on the OJP Web site at www.ojp.gov/funding/confcost.htm. This guidance sets out the current OJP policy, which requires all funding recipients that propose to hold or sponsor conferences (including meetings, trainings, and other similar events) to minimize costs, requires OJP review and prior written approval of most conference costs for cooperative agreement recipients (and certain costs for grant recipients), and generally prohibits the use of OJP funding to provide food and beverages at conferences. The guidance also sets upper limits on many conference costs, including facility space, audio/visual services, logistical planning services, programmatic planning services, and food and beverages (in the rare cases where food and beverage costs are permitted at all).

Prior review and approval of conference costs can take time (see the guidance for specific deadlines), and applicants should take this into account when submitting proposals. Applicants also should understand that conference cost limits may change and that they should check the guidance for updates before incurring such costs.

Note on food and beverages: OJP may make exceptions to the general prohibition on using OJP funding for food and beverages, but will do so only in rare cases where food and beverages are not otherwise available (e.g., in extremely remote areas); the size of the event and capacity of nearby food and beverage vendors would make it impractical to not provide food and beverages; or a special presentation at a conference requires a plenary address where conference participants have no other time to obtain food and beverages. Any such exception requires OJP's prior written approval. The restriction on food and beverages does not apply to water provided at no cost, but does apply to any and all other refreshments, regardless of the size or nature of the meeting. Additionally, this restriction does not affect direct payment of per diem amounts to individuals in a travel status under your organization's travel policy.

Costs Associated With Language Assistance (if applicable)

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

For additional information, see the "Civil Rights Compliance" section of the OJP "Other Requirements for OJP Applications" Web page at www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/other_requirements.htm.

Match Requirement

See "Cofunding" paragraph under "What an Application Should Include" (below).

Performance Measures

To assist the Department with fulfilling its responsibilities under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA), Public Law 103-62, and the GPRA Modernization Act of 2010, Public Law 111-352, applicants that receive funding under this solicitation must provide data

that measure the results of their work done under this solicitation. OJP will require any award recipient, post award, to provide the data requested in the “Data Grantee Provides” column so that OJP can calculate values for the “Performance Measures” column. (Submission of performance measures data is not required for the application.) Performance measures for this solicitation are as follows:

Objective	Performance Measure(s)	Data Grantee Provides
<p>Develop and validate a static and dynamic risk assessment tool designed for use in criminal and juvenile justice systems to estimate the short-term risk that juveniles with a history of sex offenses may recommit sex offenses .</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. A copy of the risk assessment tool validated for the purposes of this project. 3. Bi-weekly conference calls with NIJ to review progress and address issues. 4. Quarterly financial reports, monthly and semi-annual progress reports, and a final progress report. 5. If applicable, each data set that was collected, acquired, or modified in conjunction with the project. 6. If applicable, citation to report(s)/documents.

OJP does not require applicants to submit performance measures data with their applications. Instead, applicants should discuss in their application their proposed methods for collecting data for performance measures. Refer to the section “What an Application Should Include” on page 11 for additional information.

Notice of Post-Award FFATA Reporting Requirement

Applicants should anticipate that OJP will require all recipients (other than individuals) of awards of \$25,000 or more under this solicitation, consistent with the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (FFATA), to report award information on any first-tier subawards totaling \$25,000 or more, and, in certain cases, to report information on the names and total compensation of the five most highly compensated executives of the recipient and first-tier subrecipients. Each applicant entity must ensure that it has the necessary processes and

systems in place to comply with the reporting requirements should it receive funding. Reports regarding subawards will be made through the FFATA Subaward Reporting System (FSRS), found at www.fsrs.gov.

Please note also that applicants should anticipate that no subaward of an award made under this solicitation may be made to a subrecipient (other than an individual) unless the potential subrecipient acquires and provides a Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number.

What an Application Should Include

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

Moreover, applicants should anticipate that applications that are determined to be nonresponsive to the scope of the solicitation, or that do not include the application elements that NIJ has designated to be critical, will neither proceed to peer review nor receive further consideration. Under this solicitation, NIJ has designated the following application elements as critical: Program Narrative, Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative, and resumes/curriculum vitae of key personnel. Applicants may combine the Budget Narrative and the Budget Detail Worksheet in one document. However, if an applicant submits only one document, it must contain **both** narrative and detail information.

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

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

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

2. Abstract

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

- Written for a general public audience.
- Submitted as a separate attachment with <Project Abstract> as part of its file name.
- Single-spaced, using a standard 12-point font (Times New Roman) with 1-inch margins.

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

All project abstracts should follow the detailed template available at www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/Project_Abstract_Template.pdf and the supplemental instructions [below](#).

The abstract is a critical part of your application, serving as an important introduction to your proposed study. NIJ uses the abstract for a number of purposes, including assignment to the appropriate independent review panel. If your proposal is funded, the abstract typically will become public information and be used to describe your proposed work. The abstract must be 250-400 words and describe the proposed work succinctly and accurately. The abstract does not count against the 30-page limit for program narrative, and should follow this format:

1. **Goals and Objectives:** State the purpose of the project, the problem to be investigated, and the anticipated relevance to criminal justice policy, practice, and theory.
2. **Subjects:** If applicable, include the number of subjects in your study and a description of their characteristics, such as age, gender, race/ethnicity, and other pertinent attributes.
3. **Research Design and Methods:** Summarize how the work will be organized and conducted by including one or more of the following:
 - Describe the methods proposed including a clear timeline, the type of data, collection strategies, instruments, study sites, and other methods or procedures. For an evaluation, clearly describe the type of evaluation (randomized control trial, quasi-experimental design, or process evaluation).
 - State the hypothesis and the innovative potential of the research; list and briefly describe the specific aims; and briefly describe the research rationale and the experiments that will be conducted to accomplish each aim.
 - For technology development efforts, briefly describe how the technology is to be introduced into practice and any key technology challenges. If applicable, provide an overview of the anticipated commercialization strategy. For technology research and development projects, briefly describe key technology challenges and how they will be overcome.
4. **Analysis:** Summarize the techniques proposed for data analysis. Summarize steps to be taken to strengthen the reliability and validity of the analysis.

5. **Products, Reports, and Data Archiving:** Describe the expected products such as data sets, interim and final reports, and tools or technologies. If applicable, describe data to be archived under NIJ's Data Resource Program.

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

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

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

3. **Program Narrative**

The program narrative section of the application should 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.

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

The following sections should be included as part of the 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. **Resubmit Response** (if applicable) (not counted against the 30-page program narrative limit). If an applicant is resubmitting a proposal that was presented previously to NIJ, but not funded, the applicant should indicate this. A statement should be provided, no more than two pages, addressing: (1) the title, submission date, and NIJ-assigned application number of the previous proposal, and (2) a brief summary of revisions to the proposal. This document should be inserted after the abstract.

- c. **Table of Contents and Figures** (not counted against the 30-page program narrative limit).
- d. **Main body.** The main body of the program narrative should describe the project in depth. The following sections should be included as part of the program narrative:
- Statement of the Problem.
 - Project/Program Design and Implementation.
 - Capabilities/Competencies.
 - Impact/Outcomes and Evaluation.
 - Dissemination Strategy.

Within these sections, the narrative should address:

- 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.
 - Implications for criminal justice policy and practice in the United States.
 - Management plan and organization.
- e. **Appendices** (not counted against the 30-page program narrative limit) include:
- Bibliography/references.
 - Any tools/instruments, questionnaires, tables/charts/graphs, or maps pertaining to the proposed study.
 - Curriculum vitae, resumes or biographical sketches of key personnel.
 - Project timeline and research calendar with expected milestones.
 - Research independence and integrity..
 - Human Subjects Protection Paperwork including Institutional Review Board (IRB) documentation and forms (see www.ojp.gov/nij/funding/humansubjects/human-subjects.htm).
 - Privacy Certificate (for further guidance go to 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 this proposal has been submitted (if applicable).
 - Other materials specified by the solicitation.
 - Data archiving plan (see descriptive paragraph below).

Data Archiving Plan: Applications should include a brief plan to comply with data archiving requirements. The plan should be one or two pages in length and include a description of the proposed data management and archiving process including confidentiality protections and level of effort associated with meeting archiving requirements. Associated tasks should be reflected in the proposed project budget and budget narrative sections of the application.

NIJ requires that data resulting from funded research be submitted as grant products or deliverables for archiving with the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data (NACJD) (www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/NACJD/archive.jsp). The purpose of the Data Archiving Plan is to demonstrate recognition by applicants that data sets resulting from the proposed research are required to be submitted as grant products for archiving according to special grant conditions. Along with other grant products, special conditions require that all research data be submitted 90 days before the end of the project period. Some amount of grant award funds is typically withheld for submission of research data along with the final report and other products/deliverables.

The plan should be submitted as an appendix labeled, "Data Archiving Plan." The number of pages used for the plan will not count against the narrative page limit. The plan should provide brief details about the proposed archiving process including submission of these files: qualitative and quantitative data, final technical reports, instrumentation and data collection forms, and the privacy certificate and informed consent protocols including protections for confidentiality (where applicable). The focus of the Data Archiving Plan is to describe how the grant data products will be prepared and documented so as to allow reproduction of the project's findings as well as future research that can extend the scientific value of the original project (See: www.icpsr.umich.edu/files/ICPSR/access/dataprep.pdf).

Specifically, the Data Archiving Plan includes:

- Information regarding data formats (quantitative/qualitative/spatial) and software with which data will be collected, entered into a database, stored, analyzed and transferred. Standard commercial software or software typically acceptable to NACJD should be identified for use in the proposed data collection (www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/NACJD/archiving/deposit-nij-data.jsp).
- A description of procedures by which the applicant plans to collect data along with anticipated units of analysis (e.g., individuals, locations), level of analysis and other identifiers for each data file that will be submitted upon completion of the funded research.
- If the proposed research includes collection of information identifiable to private persons, the following should be included:
 - A description of all assurances of confidentiality made to those persons.
 - A copy of the consent form used.
 - A copy of the Privacy Certificate (as submitted to and approved by the funding agency).
 - IRB approval documentation.
 - Any information transfer agreement used to transfer the data with identifiers.
- Any anticipated variable creation, data transformations or scale construction that may be critical to the interpretation or analysis of the data by others.

- A plan for submission of computer programming code or software syntax providing detail on how the data will be processed including any significant treatments of the data such as de-identification, imputation, filtering or weighting.
- A description of the technical documentation (e.g., data dictionary or codebook) that explains how variables will be designated in the data file(s), such as the use of variable naming conventions and variable groups, missing data/value designations, variable and category/value labels, operational definitions and citations as needed for these variables.
- Contact information for the Principal Investigator in the event other researchers should need more information about the study or the data.

4. 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. Applicants that submit their budget in a different format should include the budget categories listed in the sample budget worksheet.

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

b. Budget Narrative

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

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

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

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

If a successful applicant's proposed match exceeds the required match amount, and OJP approves the budget, the total match amount incorporated into the approved budget becomes mandatory and subject to audit.

5. Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable)

Indirect costs are allowed only if the applicant has a federally approved indirect cost rate. (This requirement does not apply to units of local government.) Attach a copy of the federally approved indirect cost rate agreement to the application. Applicants that do not have an approved rate may request one through their cognizant federal agency, which will review all documentation and approve a rate for the applicant organization, or, if the applicant's accounting system permits, costs may be allocated in the direct cost categories. If DOJ is the cognizant federal agency, obtain information needed to submit an indirect cost rate proposal at www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/pdfs/indirect_costs.pdf.

6. Additional Attachments

a. Applicant disclosure of pending applications.

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

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

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

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

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

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

b. Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity

If a proposal involves research and/or evaluation, regardless of the proposal’s rating under the selection criteria, in order to receive funds, the applicant’s proposal must demonstrate research/evaluation independence, including appropriate safeguards to ensure research/evaluation objectivity and integrity.

For purposes of this solicitation, research and evaluation independence and integrity pertains to ensuring that the design, conduct, or reporting of research/evaluation funded by NIJ grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts will not be biased by any personal or financial conflict of interest on the part of the investigators responsible for the research/evaluation or on the part of the applicant organization. Conflicts can be either actual or apparent. Examples of potential investigator (or other personal) conflict situations may include where an investigator would be in a position to evaluate a spouse’s work product (actual conflict), or where an investigator would be in a position to evaluate the work of a former colleague (apparent conflict). With regard to potential organizational conflicts of interest, as one example, generally an organization could not be given a grant to evaluate a project if that organization had itself provided substantial prior technical assistance to that project, as the organization in such an instance would appear to be evaluating the effectiveness of its own prior work. The key is whether a reasonable person understanding all of the facts would be able to have confidence that the results of any research/evaluation project are objective and reliable. Any outside personal or financial interest that casts doubt on that objectivity and reliability is a problem. In the appendix dealing with research and evaluation independence and

integrity, the applicant should explain the process and procedures that the applicant has put in place to identify and eliminate (or, at the very least, mitigate) potential personal or financial conflicts of interest on the part of its staff, consultants, and/or subrecipients. It should also identify any potential organizational conflicts of interest on the part of the applicant with regard to the proposed research/evaluation. If the applicant reasonably believes that no potential personal or organizational conflicts of interest exist, then the applicant should provide a brief narrative explanation of how and why it reached that conclusion.

Where potential personal or organizational conflicts of interest exist, in the appendix, the applicant should identify the safeguards the applicant has or will put in place to eliminate, mitigate, explain, or otherwise address those conflicts of interest.

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

7. Other Standard Forms

Additional forms that OJP may require in connection with an award are available on OJP's funding page at www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/forms.htm. For successful applicants, receipt of funds may be contingent upon submission of all necessary forms. Note in particular the following forms:

- a. [Standard Assurances](#)^{*}
Applicants must read, certify, and submit this form in GMS prior to the receipt of any award funds.
- b. [Certifications Regarding Lobbying; Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters; and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements](#)^{*}
Applicants must read, certify, and submit in GMS prior to the receipt of any award funds.
- c. [Accounting System and Financial Capability Questionnaire](#)
Any applicant (other than an individual) that is a non-governmental entity and that has not received any award from OJP within the past 3 years, must download, complete, and submit this form.

*These OJP Standard Assurances and Certifications are forms which applicants accept in GMS. They are not additional forms to be uploaded at the time of application submission.

Selection Criteria

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

Project/Program Design and Implementation (Quality and technical merit)—30%

1. Awareness of the state of current research.
2. Soundness of methods 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)—20%

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—10%

NOTE: *The budget should be complete, cost effective, and allowable (e.g., reasonable, allocable, and necessary for project activities.) Budget narratives should generally demonstrate how applicants will maximize cost effectiveness of grant expenditures. Budget narratives should demonstrate cost effectiveness in relation to potential alternatives and the goals of the project.*¹⁰

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

Impact/Outcomes and Evaluation (Relevance to policy and practice)—20%

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 products, when applicable (e.g., purchase price and maintenance costs for a new technology or cost of training to use the technology).

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. The application may include letters showing support from practitioners, but they carry less weight than clear evidence of the applicant's understanding of how policymakers and practitioners can best use and benefit from the

¹⁰ Generally speaking, a reasonable cost is a cost that, in its nature or amount, does not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person under the circumstances prevailing at the time the decision was made to incur the costs.

proposed work. While a partnership may affect State or local activities, it should also have broader implications for other communities nationwide.

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 that NIJ should consider developing for practitioners and policymakers.
3. If applicable, a clear strategy leading to the adoption into practice of any equipment or software.

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 review 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. An external peer reviewer is an expert in the subject matter of a given solicitation who is NOT a current DOJ employee. An internal reviewer is a current DOJ employee who is well-versed or has expertise in the subject matter of this solicitation. A peer review panel will evaluate, score, and rate applications that meet basic minimum requirements. Peer reviewers' ratings and any resulting recommendations are advisory only. In addition to peer review ratings, considerations for award recommendations and decisions may include, but are not limited to, underserved populations, geographic diversity, strategic priorities, past performance, and available funding.

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

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

All final award decisions will be made by the Director of the National Institute of Justice, who may consider factors including, but not limited to, underserved populations, geographic diversity, strategic priorities, past performance, and available funding when making awards.

Additional Requirements

Applicants selected for awards must agree to comply with additional legal requirements upon acceptance of an award. OJP encourages applicants to review the information pertaining to

these additional requirements prior to submitting an application. Additional information for each requirement can be found at www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/other_requirements.htm.

- Civil Rights Compliance
- Civil Rights Compliance Specific to State Administering Agencies
- Faith-Based and Other Community Organizations
- Confidentiality
- Research and the Protection of Human Subjects
- Anti-Lobbying Act
- Financial and Government Audit Requirements
- National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)
- DOJ Information Technology Standards (if applicable)
- Single Point of Contact Review
- Non-Supplanting of State or Local Funds
- Criminal Penalty for False Statements
- Compliance with [Office of Justice Programs Financial Guide](#)
- Suspension or Termination of Funding
- Nonprofit Organizations
- For-profit Organizations
- Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA)
- Rights in Intellectual Property
- Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (FFATA)
- Awards in Excess of \$5,000,000 – Federal Taxes Certification Requirement
- Policy and Guidance for Conference Approval, Planning, and Reporting
- OJP Training Guiding Principles for Grantees and Subgrantees

If a proposal is funded, the award recipient 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, placed in the context of existing literature; 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 electronic format.

Bi-weekly conference calls: The successful awardee will be required to speak to NIJ on a bi-weekly basis to discuss project progress and address issues, as needed.

Risk assessment tool: The successful awardee will provide a copy of the risk assessment tool validated for the purposes of this project to NIJ.

Interim reports: Grantees must submit quarterly financial reports, monthly and 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 Plan section of the proposal.

How to Apply

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

Note: NIJ encourages all prospective applicants to sign up for Grants.gov email notifications regarding this solicitation. If this solicitation is cancelled or modified, individuals who sign up with Grants.gov for email updates will be notified.

All applicants are required to complete the following steps:

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

Applicants that were previously registered in the CCR database must, at a minimum:

- Create a SAM account.
- Log in to SAM and migrate permissions to the SAM account (all the entity registrations and records should already have been migrated).

Applicants that were not previously registered in the CCR database must register in SAM prior to registering in Grants.gov. Information about SAM registration procedures can be accessed at www.sam.gov.

3. **Acquire an Authorized Organization Representative (AOR) and a Grants.gov username and password.** Complete the AOR profile on Grants.gov and create a username and password. The applicant organization's DUNS number must be used to complete this step. For more information about the registration process, go to www.grants.gov/applicants/get_registered.jsp.
4. **Acquire confirmation for the AOR from the E-Business Point of Contact (E-Biz POC).** The E-Biz POC at the applicant organization must log into Grants.gov to confirm the applicant organization's AOR. Note that an organization can have more than one AOR.

5. **Search for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov.** Use the following identifying information when searching for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov. The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number for this solicitation is 16.560, titled “National Institute of Justice Research, Evaluation, and Development Project Grants,” and the funding opportunity number is NIJ-2013-3614.
6. **Complete the Disclosure of Lobbying Activities.** All applicants must complete this information. Applicants that expend any funds for lobbying activities must provide the detailed information requested on the form, *Disclosure of Lobbying Activities* (SF-LLL). Applicants that do not expend any funds for lobbying activities should enter “N/A” in the required highlighted fields.
7. **Submit an application consistent with this solicitation by following the directions in Grants.gov.** Within 24–48 hours after submitting the electronic application, the applicant should receive an e-mail validation message from Grants.gov. The message will state whether the application has been received and validated, or rejected due to errors, with an explanation. **Important:** OJP urges applicants to submit applications **at least 72 hours prior** to the application due date to allow time to receive validation messages or rejection notifications from Grants.gov, and to correct in a timely fashion any problems that may have caused a rejection notification.

Note: Grants.gov only permits the use of specific characters in names of attachment files. Valid file names may only include the following characters: A-Z, a-z, 0-9, underscore (), hyphen (-), space, and period. 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.”

Note: Duplicate Applications

If an applicant submits multiple versions of an application, NIJ will review the most recent version submitted.

Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues

Applicants that experience unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond their control that prevent them from submitting their application by the deadline must e-mail the NIJ contact identified in the Contact Information section on the title page **within 24 hours after the application deadline** and request approval to submit their application. The e-mail must describe the technical difficulties, and include a timeline of the applicant’s submission efforts, the complete grant application, the applicant’s DUNS number, and any Grants.gov Help Desk or SAM tracking number(s). **Note: NIJ does not automatically approve requests.** After the program office reviews the submission, and contacts the Grants.gov or SAM Help Desks to validate the reported technical issues, OJP will inform the applicant whether the request to submit a late application has been approved or denied. If the technical issues reported cannot be validated, OJP will reject the application as untimely.

The following conditions are not valid reasons to permit late submissions: (1) failure to register 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 each instruction in the OJP solicitation, and (4) technical issues with the applicant's computer or information technology environment, including firewalls.

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

Provide Feedback to OJP on This Solicitation

To assist OJP in improving its application and award processes, we encourage applicants to provide feedback on this solicitation, the application submission process, and/or the application review/peer review process. Feedback may be provided to

OJPSolicitationFeedback@usdoj.gov.

IMPORTANT: This email is for feedback and suggestions only. Replies are **not** sent from this mailbox. If you have specific questions on any program or technical aspect of the solicitation, **you must** directly contact the appropriate number or email listed on the front of this solicitation document. These contacts are provided to help ensure that you can directly reach an individual who can address your specific questions in a timely manner.

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

Application Checklist

Basic Scientific Research to Assess Youth With Sexual Offending Behavior

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

What an Application Should Include:

- _____ Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) (see page 11)
- _____ Abstract (250 – 400 words) (see page 11)
- _____ Program Narrative (see page 13)
 - _____ Double Spaced
 - _____ 12-point standard font
 - _____ 1" standard margins
 - _____ Narrative 30 pages or less
- _____ Appendices to the Program Narrative (see page 14)
 - _____ Bibliography/references
 - _____ Any tools/instruments, questionnaires, tables/charts/graphs, or maps pertaining to the proposed study
 - _____ Curriculum vitae, resumes, or biographical sketches of key personnel
 - _____ Project timeline and research calendar with expected milestones
 - _____ Research independence and integrity
 - _____ 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 this proposal has been submitted (if applicable)
 - _____ Data Archiving Plan
- _____ Budget Detail Worksheet (see page 16)
- _____ Budget Narrative (see page 13)
- _____ Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL), "if applicable" (see page 25)
- _____ Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable) (see page 17)
- _____ Additional Attachments (if applicable) (see page 17)
- _____ Applicant disclosure of Pending Applications (see page 17)
- _____ Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity (see page 18)
- _____ Other Standard Forms as applicable (see page 19), including:
 - _____ Accounting System and Financial Capability Questionnaire (if applicable)