OMB No. 1121-0329 Approval Expires 07/31/2016

U.S. Department of JusticeOffice of Justice Programs

Bureau of Justice Assistance



The <u>U.S. Department of Justice</u> (DOJ), <u>Office of Justice Programs</u> (OJP), <u>Bureau of Justice</u> <u>Assistance</u> (BJA) is seeking applications for the Smart Prosecution Initiative. This program furthers the Department's mission by assisting state and local jurisdictions in reducing crime and improving the functioning of the criminal justice system.

Smart Prosecution Initiative FY 2016 Competitive Grant Announcement

Applications Due: March 28, 2016

Eligibility

Eligible applicants are limited to state, local, and tribal prosecutor agencies or a government agency or nonprofit organization as fiscal agent for the applicant.

BJA welcomes applications that involve two or more entities that will carry out the funded federal award activities; however, one eligible entity must be the applicant and the others must be proposed as subrecipients. The applicant must be the entity with primary responsibility for administering the funding and managing the entire project. Only one application per lead applicant will be considered; however, a subrecipient may be part of multiple proposals.

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

Deadline

Applicants must register with <u>Grants.gov</u> prior to submitting an application. All applications are due to be submitted and in receipt of a successful validation message in Grants.gov by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on March 28, 2016.

All applicants are encouraged to read this <u>Important Notice: Applying for Grants in</u> Grants.gov.

For additional information, see <u>How to Apply</u> in <u>Section D: Application and Submission</u> Information.

Contact Information

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

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

For assistance with any other requirement of this solicitation, contact the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) Response Center: toll-free at 800-851-3420; via TTY at 301-240-6310 (hearing impaired only); email grants@ncjrs.gov; fax to 301-240-5830; or web chat at https://webcontact.ncjrs.gov/ncjchat/chat.jsp. The NCJRS Response Center hours of operation are 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. eastern time, Monday through Friday, and 10:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. eastern time on the solicitation close date.

Grants.gov number assigned to this announcement: BJA-2016-8991

Release date: February 11, 2016

Contents

A. Program Description	4
Overview	4
Program-Specific Information	4
Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables	6
Evidence-Based Programs or Practices	7
B. Federal Award Information	8
Type of Award	8
Financial Management and System of Internal Controls	9
Budget Information	9
Cost Sharing or Matching Requirement	9
Pre-Agreement Cost (also known as Pre-award Cost) Approvals	9
Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver	10
Prior Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conference/Meeting/Training Costs	10
Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable)	10
C. Eligibility Information	11
Limit on Number of Application Submissions	11
D. Application and Submission Information	11
What an Application Should Include	11
How to Apply	19
E. Application Review Information	23
Selection Criteria	23
Review Process	24
F. Federal Award Administration Information	26
Federal Award Notices	26
Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements	26
General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements	27
G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)	27
H. Other Information	27
Provide Feedback to OJP	27
Application Checklist	28

Smart Prosecution Initiative (CFDA # 16.825)

A. Program Description

Overview

BJA's "Smart Suite" of programs invest in the development of practitioner—researcher partnerships that use data, evidence, and innovation to create strategies and interventions that are effective and economical. This data-driven approach enables jurisdictions to understand the full nature and extent of the crime challenges they are facing and to target resources to the highest priorities. The Smart Suite of programs, which includes the Smart Prosecution Initiative, represents a strategic approach that brings more "science" into criminal justice operations by leveraging innovative applications of analysis, technology, and evidence-based practices with the goal of improving performance and effectiveness while containing costs.

As part of BJA's Smart Suite, the FY 2016 Smart Prosecution Initiative seeks to build upon analysis-driven, evidence-based prosecution by encouraging state, local, and tribal prosecutorial agencies to develop effective, economical, and innovative responses to crime within their jurisdictions. Funding for this initiative is available through the FY 2016 appropriation to "enhance prosecutorial decision-making."

Program-Specific Information

As prosecutors implement innovative, best practices, or evidence-based approaches to address the goals listed below, there is a need to evaluate their efforts. Smart Prosecution seeks to encourage exploration of new solutions to public safety concerns, as well as internal operations and organizational structure, while employing research partners at the problem definition stage through assessment of strategies and solutions. Some creative solutions developed by prosecutors around the country include changing how their organizations prioritize cases, using zone/geographic prosecution, using crime analysis tools to reduce gun violence, nuisance abatement, crime prevention through environmental design, drug-free and prostitute-free zones, restorative justice, community courts, truancy abatement, diversion programs, crime analysis, and cyber-crime strategies to improve public safety. Prosecutors are becoming partnership builders who bring the police, the community, and other criminal justice and local agencies together to find ways they can work together to solve problems in their jurisdictions.

Examples of previous Smart Prosecution programs include:

- In San Diego (CA), a coalition of criminal justice partners led by the City Attorney's Office is developing the San Diego Community Court, a new post-plea diversion initiative designed to provide accountability, early intervention, and swift consequences for eligible misdemeanor offenders
- In Kings County (NY), the District Attorney's Office is creating a comprehensive approach to adolescent and young adult prosecution including a Young Adult Court to handle defendants up to age 24.
- In St. Louis (MO), the Circuit Attorney is implementing GunStat. In addition, the office will
 establish a diversion program targeting felony defendants most likely to carry a weapon
 illegally as those likely to reoffend or to perpetuate gun violence.

- In Baltimore (MD), the Office of the State's Attorney is developing an automated evidencebased risk assessment to evaluate defendants charged at Central Booking, make evidencebased release recommendations, and identify defendants for diversion and alternative to incarceration programs.
- In Cook County (IL), the Office of the State's Attorney is expanding and evaluating their Misdemeanor Deferred Prosecution Enhancement Program.
- In Harris County (TX), the District Attorney's Office is establishing a Misdemeanor Prostitution Court that identifies and treats the needs of prostituted young adults.
- In Los Angeles (CA), the City Attorney is implementing a program that utilizes evidence-based risk assessments to evaluate prosecutorial diversion options.
- In San Francisco (CA), the District Attorney's Office is establishing a Crime Strategies and Intelligence Unit.

BJA believes that several core elements must be in place to support a successful Smart Prosecution Initiative project. These include strong executive support for the project within the prosecutor's office; sophisticated problem and data analysis efforts; the incorporation of the research partner in all aspects of the initiative; and a commitment to making organizational and operational changes to sustain the strategies found to be successful as measured by the project's evaluation. In addition, experiences of current and former Smart Prosecution sites highlight the pressing need to engage members of their communities as allies in preventing and reducing crime. Under Smart Prosecution, prosecutors are strongly encouraged to establish innovative and effective working relationships with citizens and community leaders to gain support for their proposed initiatives. Agencies are also expected to leverage data from other criminal justice entities—such as parole, probation, and law enforcement agencies—to aid in their activities.

To ensure their initiative's effectiveness, current Smart Prosecution grantees work closely with BJA and BJA's competitively funded training and technical assistance partner to participate in information sharing sessions, facilitate peer-to-peer exchanges of information, access subject matter expertise that is relevant to specific Smart Prosecution projects, and produce reports on the lessons learned from the Smart Prosecution community. In addition, all Smart Prosecution grantees are required to produce a project action plan in collaboration with BJA and its training and technical assistance partner.

Applicants should devote at least 20 percent of the project budget to support the evaluation component of their initiative. The provision of appropriate resources for the selected research partner is crucial to project success, as they are expected to play a critical role in the project's data collection and analysis, problem assessment, strategy development, and evaluation processes. The research partner must be identified by name and institutional affiliation in the application and can be an independent consultant or located in an academic institution; a state Statistical Analysis Center; or a research organization. The research partner should have demonstrated expertise conducting the type of work proposed.

For more information on Smart Prosecution and details on individual site activities, go to www.smartprosecution.org. This web site provides information and resources to BJA Smart Prosecution agency participants and to the nation's prosecution community. For additional information about identifying and working with a research partner, please see http://www.psnmsu.com/documents/ResearchPartnerQ&A.pdf.

Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables

The purpose of Smart Prosecution is to develop a body of knowledge about data-driven strategies—innovative, best practice, or evidence-based—as they are implemented by prosecutors. BJA is seeking applications from state, local, or tribal prosecutor agencies interested in testing data-driven approaches that address one or more of the three goals listed below. Smart Prosecution applicants will identify a problem to be addressed and enlist an independent research partner to help evaluate the effectiveness of their Smart Prosecution effort.

The implemented strategies will address enhanced decision-making in connection with one or more of the following goals:

- Promoting fair, impartial, and expeditious pursuit of justice;
- Ensuring safe communities; and
- Promoting integrity in the prosecution profession and effective coordination in the criminal justice system.

Applicants are strongly encouraged to focus on enhancing decision-making in connection with problems likely to be confronted by other prosecutors' offices in the United States. Examples of such initiatives include but are not limited to:

- Effective prevention and responses to violent crime including focused deterrence;
- The use of crime analysis and crime strategies units to identify and target prosecution priorities;
- Innovative approaches to improving victim and witness cooperation with the justice system;
- Collaborative responses to reduce chronic gun and gang violence in a specific community such as GunStat or gun crime intelligence centers;
- Effective approaches to increasing analytical capacity and evidence based programming within a prosecutorial agency;
- Interventions focusing on young adults between the ages of 18-25;
- Institutionalizing evidence-based policies, procedures, tactics, and strategies throughout a prosecutorial organization.

This program's required deliverables are:

- An action plan that is produced by the grantee agency at the outset of each project, which includes the project's problem analysis, logic model, summary of strategies and intended outcomes, and research base for proposed strategies. The action plan is envisioned as a product of collaboration among the supervision agency, research partner, and technical assistance provider. For more information about the required action plan, see page 8.
- A final analysis report of the project's implementation and outcomes produced by the research partner and submitted to BJA at the conclusion of the project.

Applicants will:

- Describe the innovative, data-driven approach to be implemented.
- Enlist a qualified¹ research partner to evaluate the effectiveness of the approach.
- Identify a specific prosecution problem to address.
- Develop a prevention/mitigation/response strategy to address the problem.
- Evaluate the initiative.
- Assess and report the results to BJA, who will make the results publicly available.

The evaluation design must include outcome measures capable of informing a credible assessment of the effectiveness of the intervention(s). Applications absent such measures will not be awarded.

The proposed projects should present strategies that hold promise for replication and testing by other jurisdictions.

Evidence-Based Programs or Practices

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

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

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

¹ The involvement of a research partner is indispensable to a successful Smart Prosecution project, and it is important that prosecutorial agencies consider the following when choosing partner candidates or organizations for the position.

Policy, program, action research or organization evaluation experience, preferably in policing or in the
justice system, is highly recommended.

Previous experience working with prosecutorial agencies and/or organizations.

Candidates should be experienced in several different data collection methodologies, and in both
quantitative and qualitative research methods. It is preferable that they have several years of
evaluation research experience and have experience with oral and written presentations of research
results

[•] Research partners should be able to conduct scientifically rigorous evaluations and be well versed in evaluation methods.

For examples of research on police and crime reduction, view the George Mason University's Evidence-Based Policing Matrix[©], available at http://cebcp.org/evidence-based-policing/the-matrix/. The Matrix is a research-to-practice translation tool that categorizes and visualizes all experimental and quasi-experimental research on police and crime reduction.

B. Federal Award Information

BJA estimates that it will make up to four awards of up to \$400,000 each for an estimated total of \$1.6 million for a 24-month project period, beginning on October 1, 2016.

BJA may, in certain cases, provide supplemental funding in future years to awards under this solicitation. Important considerations in decisions regarding supplemental funding include, among other factors, the availability of funding, strategic priorities, assessment of the quality of the management of the award (for example, timeliness and quality of progress reports), and assessment of the progress of the work funded under the award.

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

Award Special Condition

Once awarded, each grant award will have in place a special condition withholding all but \$150,000, which will allow grantees to establish an action plan within 180 days of the date of this initial funding release. The action plan must:

- Describe the problem and the data that led to its identification.
- Include a logic model that identifies the solution(s) to be tested and projects result(s).
- Include an impact evaluation plan.
- Ensure that a research partner is included, as well as a contract, agreement, memoranda of
 understanding or other similar legal instrument that clearly delineates the roles and
 responsibilities of the research partner. This document should clearly establish the authority
 of the research partner to access relevant agency data, interview subject personnel, and
 monitor agency operations that are relevant to the evaluation of the initiative.
- Demonstrate executive support and commitment of agency resources to the project.
- Include letters of commitment from external agencies or organizations that are expected to participate in the project.

The remaining funds will be released to each grantee only after BJA approves an acceptable action plan.

Type of Award²

BJA expects that it will make any award from this solicitation in the form of a grant.

² See generally 31 U.S.C. §§ 6301-6305 (defines and describes various forms of federal assistance relationships, including grants and cooperative agreements (a type of grant)).

Financial Management and System of Internal Controls

Award recipients and subrecipients (including any recipient or subrecipient funded in response to this solicitation that is a pass-through entity³) must, as described in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements set out at 2 C.F.R. 200.303:

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

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

Budget Information

Cost Sharing or Matching Requirement

This solicitation does not require a match. However, if a successful application proposes a voluntary match amount, and OJP approves the budget, the total match amount incorporated into the approved budget becomes mandatory and subject to audit.

Pre-Agreement Cost (also known as Pre-award Cost) Approvals

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

OJP does not typically approve pre-agreement costs; an applicant must request and obtain the prior written approval of OJP for all such costs. If approved, pre-agreement costs could be paid from grant funds consistent with a grantee's approved budget, and under applicable cost standards. However, all such costs prior to award and prior to approval of the costs are incurred

³ For purposes of this program announcement), "pass-through entity" includes any entity eligible to receive funding as a recipient or subrecipient under program announcement that, if funded, may make a subaward(s) to a subrecipient(s) to carry out part of the funded program.

at the sole risk of an applicant. Generally, no applicant should incur project costs *before* submitting an application requesting federal funding for those costs. Should there be extenuating circumstances that appear to be appropriate for OJP's consideration as preagreement costs, the applicant should contact the point of contact listed on the title page of this announcement for details on the requirements for submitting a written request for approval. See the section on Costs Requiring Prior Approval in the <u>Financial Guide</u>, for more information.

Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver

With respect to any award of more than \$250,000 made under this solicitation, recipients may not use federal funds to pay total cash compensation (salary plus cash bonuses) to any employee of the award recipient at a rate that exceeds 110 percent of the maximum annual salary payable to a member of the Federal Government's Senior Executive Service (SES) at an agency with a Certified SES Performance Appraisal System for that year. ⁴ The 2016 salary table for SES employees is available at the Office of Personnel Management website. Note: A recipient may compensate an employee at a greater rate, provided the amount in excess of this compensation limitation is paid with non-federal funds. (Any such additional compensation will not be considered matching funds where match requirements apply.) For employees who charge only a portion of their time to an award, the allowable amount to be charged is equal to the percentage of time worked times the maximum salary limitation.

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

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

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

OJP strongly encourages applicants that propose to use award funds for any conference-,
meeting-, or training-related activity to review carefully—before submitting an application—the
OJP policy and guidance on conference approval, planning, and reporting available at
http://ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/PostawardRequirements/chapter3.10a.htm. OJP policy and
guidance (1) encourage minimization of conference, meeting, and training costs; (2) require
prior written approval (which may affect project timelines) of most conference, meeting, and
training costs for cooperative agreement recipients and of some conference, meeting, and
training costs for grant recipients; and (3) set cost limits, including a general prohibition of all
food and beverage costs.

Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable)

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

⁴ OJP does not apply this limitation on the use of award funds to the nonprofit organizations listed at Appendix VIII to 2 C.F.R. Part 200.

to provide meaningful access to services or benefits may include interpretation or translation services where appropriate.

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

C. Eligibility Information

For additional eligibility information, see the title page.

For additional information on cost sharing and match requirement, see Section B. Federal Award Information.

Limit on Number of Application Submissions

If an applicant submits multiple versions of the same application, BJA will review <u>only</u> the most recent system-validated version submitted. For more information on system-validated versions, see <u>How to Apply</u>.

D. Application and Submission Information

What an Application Should Include

Applicants should anticipate that if they fail to submit an application that contains all of the specified elements, it may 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 BJA has designated to be critical, will neither proceed to peer review nor receive further consideration. Under this solicitation, BJA has designated the following application elements as critical: Program Narrative, Budget Detail Worksheet, and Budget Narrative. Applicants may combine the Budget Narrative and the Budget Detail Worksheet in one document. However, if an applicant submits only one budget document, it must contain **both** narrative and detail information. Please review the "Note on File Names and File Types" under How to Apply to be sure applications are submitted in permitted formats.

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

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

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

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

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

2. Project Abstract

Applications should include a high-quality project abstract that summarizes the proposed project in 400 words or less. 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 ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/ProjectAbstractTemplate.pdf.

Permission to Share Project Abstract with the Public: It is unlikely that BJA will be able to fund all applications submitted under this solicitation, but it may have the opportunity to share information with the public regarding unfunded applications; for example, through a listing on a web page 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 unfunded applications, should the abstract fail to meet the format and content requirements noted above and outlined in the project abstract template.

3. Program Narrative

The program narrative must respond to the solicitation (see Program-Specific Information on page 4) and the Selection Criteria (see page 23) in the order given. The program narrative should be double-spaced, using a standard 12-point font (Times New Roman is preferred) with 1-inch margins, and should not exceed 10 pages. Number pages "1 of 10," "2 of 10," etc.

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

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

- a. Statement of the Problem
- b. Project Design and Implementation
- c. Capabilities and Competencies
- d. Plan for Collecting the Data Required for this Solicitation's Performance Measures

To demonstrate program progress and success, as well as to assist the Department with fulfilling its responsibilities under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA), Public Law 103-62, and the GPRA Modernization Act of 2010, Public Law 111–352, applicants that receive funding under this solicitation must provide data that measure the results of their work done under this solicitation. OJP will require any award recipient, post award, to provide the data requested in the "Data Grantee Provides" column so that OJP can calculate values for the "Performance Measures" column. Performance measures for this solicitation are as follows:

Objective	Catalogue ID	Performance Measure(s)	Data Grantee Provides
Identify and address a new solution to a specific public safety concern, internal operation or organizational structure, using an analysis-driven/innovative	269	Percent of program goals and objectives completed that are directly linked to grant funding and address a specific problem	Number of program tasks that were completed during the reporting period that are directly linked to grant funding (Task: a grant activity defined in application project plan)
approach.			Number of total program tasks (complete or incomplete) that are directly linked to grant funding
	163	Number of new solutions employed	Number of new solutions employed during the current reporting period
	321	Number of evidence-based practices deployed	Number of evidence-based practices deployed over the life of the grant
Enhance prosecutorial knowledge of effective strategies and tactics for crime problems or criminogenic circumstances.	440	Number of engagements with the TTA partner	During the reporting period, the number TTA engagements: A. Telephonic Technical Assistance B. Onsite Visits/Technical Assistance C. In-Person Training Sessions D. Web-based Training Sessions
Support and sustain evidence-based prosecution and public safety strategies.	630	Percent of prosecutors involved in the initiative using data analysis	Number of prosecutors involved in the initiative during the reporting period. Number of prosecutors using
	243	Number of partnerships established with other criminal justice organizations or agencies	data analysis Number of formal agreements signed with new research partnerships during the reporting period (e.g. MOUs, LOAs, other formal agreements)

		Number of new partnerships formed with other criminal justice organizations or agencies during the reporting period
261	Number of public/community briefings or trainings promoting evidence-based practices	Number of briefings or outreach to the public/community about evidence based practices
		Type of briefings or outreach to the public/community about evidence based practices
146	Number of research partner engagements	During the reporting period, number of times staff engaged in the initiative met with the research partner.
		Please describe the activities that the research partner is conducting.

BJA does not require applicants to submit performance measures data with their application. Performance measures are included as an alert that BJA will require successful applicants to submit specific data as part of their reporting requirements. For the application, applicants should indicate an understanding of these requirements and discuss how they will gather the required data, should they receive funding.

Note on Project Evaluations

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

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

4. Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative

a. Budget Detail Worksheet

A sample Budget Detail Worksheet can be found at http://ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/BudgetDetailWorksheet.pdf. Applicants that submit their budget in a different format should include the budget categories listed in the sample budget worksheet. The Budget Detail Worksheet should be broken down by year.

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

b. Budget Narrative

The Budget Narrative should thoroughly and clearly describe <u>every</u> 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 <u>all</u> costs, and how they are relevant to the completion of the proposed project. The narrative may include tables for clarification purposes but need not be in a spreadsheet format. As with the Budget Detail Worksheet, the Budget Narrative should be broken down by year.

c. Non-Competitive Procurement Contracts In Excess of Simplified Acquisition Threshold

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

d. Pre-Agreement Cost Approvals

For information on pre-agreement costs, see Section B. Federal Award Information.

5. Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable)

Indirect costs are allowed only under the following circumstances:

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

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

In order to use the "de minimis" indirect rate, attach written documentation to the application that advises OJP of both the applicant's eligibility (to use the "de minimis" rate) and its election. If the applicant elects the "de minimis" method, costs must be consistently charged as either indirect or direct costs, but may not be double charged or inconsistently charged as both. In addition, if this method is chosen then it must be used consistently for all federal awards until such time as you choose to negotiate a federally approved indirect cost rate.⁵

6. Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable)

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

7. Applicant Disclosure of High Risk Status

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

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

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

-

⁵ See 2 C.F.R. § 200.414(f).

8. Additional Attachments

a. Timeline

Attach a project timeline that includes each project goal, related objective, activity, expected completion date, and responsible person or organization.

b. Letter of Support of the Chief Prosecutor

Attach a letter of support signed by the Chief Prosecutor of the applying jurisdiction that states their support of the project.

c. Resumes

Attach the resumes of key project staff and the identified research partner(s).

d. Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications

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

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

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

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

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

Applicants should include the table as a separate attachment to their application. The file should be named "Disclosure of Pending Applications."

Applicants that do not have pending applications as described above are to include a statement to this effect in the separate attachment page (e.g., "[Applicant Name on SF-424] does not have pending applications submitted within the last 12 months for

federally funded grants or subgrants (including cooperative agreements) that include requests for funding to support the same project being proposed under this solicitation and will cover the identical cost items outlined in the Budget Narrative and Budget Detail Worksheet in the application under this solicitation.").

e. Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity

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

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

OR

- b. A specific listing of actual or perceived conflicts of interest that the applicant has identified in relation to this proposal. These conflicts could be either personal (related to specific staff, consultants, and/or subrecipients) or organizational (related to the applicant or any subgrantee organization). Examples of potential investigator (or other personal) conflict situations may include, but are not limited to, those in which an investigator would be in a position to evaluate a spouse's work product (actual conflict), or an investigator would be in a position to evaluate the work of a former or current colleague (potential apparent conflict). With regard to potential organizational conflicts of interest, as one example, generally an organization could not be given a grant to evaluate a project if that organization had itself provided substantial prior technical assistance to that specific project or a location implementing the project (whether funded by OJP or other sources), as the organization in such an instance would appear to be evaluating the effectiveness of its own prior work. The key is whether a reasonable person understanding all of the facts would be able to have confidence that the results of any research or evaluation project are objective and reliable. Any outside personal or financial interest that casts doubt on that objectivity and reliability of an evaluation or research product is a problem and must be disclosed.
- ii. In addition, for purposes of this solicitation applicants must address the issue of possible mitigation of research integrity concerns by including, at a minimum, one of the following two items:

a. If an applicant reasonably believes that no potential personal or organizational conflicts of interest exist, then the applicant should provide a brief narrative explanation of how and why it reached that conclusion. Applicants MUST also include an explanation of the specific processes and procedures that the applicant will put in place to identify and eliminate (or, at the very least, mitigate) potential personal or financial conflicts of interest on the part of its staff, consultants, and/or subrecipients for this particular project, should that be necessary during the grant period. Documentation that may be helpful in this regard could include organizational codes of ethics/conduct or policies regarding organizational, personal, and financial conflicts of interest.

OR

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

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

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

10. Disclosure of Lobbying Activities

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

How to Apply

Applicants must register in and submit applications through Grants.gov, a primary source to find federal funding opportunities and apply for funding. Find complete instructions on how to register and submit an application at www.Grants.gov. Applicants that experience technical difficulties during this process should call the Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline at **800-518-4726** or **606-545-5035**, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, except federal holidays. Registering

with Grants.gov is a one-time process; however, **processing delays may occur, and it can take several weeks** for first-time registrants to receive confirmation and a user password. OJP encourages applicants to **register several weeks before** the application submission deadline. In addition, OJP urges applicants to submit applications 72 hours prior to the application due date to allow time to receive validation messages or rejection notifications from Grants.gov, and to correct in a timely fashion any problems that may have caused a rejection notification.

BJA strongly encourages all prospective applicants to sign up for Grants.gov email <u>notifications</u> this solicitation. If this solicitation is cancelled or modified, individuals who sign up with Grants.gov for updates will be automatically notified.

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

Note on File Names and File Types: Grants.gov <u>only</u> permits the use of <u>certain specific</u> characters in names of attachment files. Valid file names may include <u>only</u> the characters shown in the table below. Grants.gov is designed to reject any application that includes an attachment(s) with a file name that contains any characters not shown in the table below.

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

Grants.gov is designed to forward successfully submitted applications to the OJP 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." GMS may reject applications with files that use these extensions. It is important to allow time to change the type of file(s) if the application is rejected.

All applicants are required to complete the following steps:

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

Individual applicants should search Grants.gov for a funding opportunity for which individuals are eligible to apply. Use the Funding Opportunity Number (FON) to register. Complete the registration form at https://apply07.grants.gov/apply/IndCPRegister to create a username and password. Individual applicants should complete all steps except 1, 2, and 4.

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

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

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

- 3. Acquire an Authorized Organization Representative (AOR) and a Grants.gov username and password. Complete the AOR profile on Grants.gov and create a username and password. The applicant organization's DUNS number must be used to complete this step. For more information about the registration process for organizations, go to www.grants.gov/web/grants/register.html. Individuals registering with Grants.gov should go to https://apply07.grants.gov/apply/IndCPRegister.
- 4. Acquire confirmation for the AOR from the E-Business Point of Contact (E-Biz POC). The E-Biz POC at the applicant organization must log into Grants.gov to confirm the applicant organization's AOR. The E-Biz POC will need the Marketing Partner Identification Number (MPIN) password obtained when registering with SAM to complete this step. Note that an organization can have more than one AOR.
- 5. Search for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov. Use the following identifying information when searching for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov. The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance number for this solicitation is 16.825, titled "Smart Prosecution Initiative," and the funding opportunity number is BJA-2016-8991.
- 6. Submit a valid application consistent with this solicitation by following the directions in Grants.gov. Within 24–48 hours after submitting the electronic application, the applicant should receive two notifications from Grants.gov. The first will confirm the receipt of the application and the second will state whether the application has been successfully validated, or rejected due to errors, with an explanation. It is possible to first receive a

message indicating that the application is received and then receive a rejection notice a few minutes or hours later. Submitting well ahead of the deadline provides time to correct the problem(s) that caused the rejection. Important: OJP urges applicants to submit applications at least 72 hours prior to the application due date to allow time to receive validation messages or rejection notifications from Grants.gov, and to correct in a timely fashion any problems that may have caused a rejection notification. All applications are due to be submitted and in receipt of a successful validation message in Grants.gov by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on March 28, 2016.

7. Click here for further details on DUNS, SAM, and Grants.gov registration steps and timeframes.

Note: Duplicate Applications

If an applicant submits multiple versions of the same application, BJA will review <u>only</u> the most recent system-validated version submitted. See Note on File Names and File Types under <u>How To Apply</u>.

Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues

Applicants that experience unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond their control that prevent them from submitting their application by the deadline must contact the Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline or the SAM Help Desk to report the technical issue and receive a tracking number. The applicant must email the BJA contact identified in the Contact Information section on page 2 within 24 hours after the application deadline and request approval to submit their application. The email 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: BJA does not automatically approve requests. After the program office reviews the submission, and contacts the Grants.gov or SAM Help Desks to validate the reported technical issues, OJP will inform the applicant whether the request to submit a late application has been approved or denied. If OJP determines that the applicant failed to follow all required procedures, which resulted in an untimely application submission, OJP will deny the applicant's request to submit their application.

The following conditions are generally insufficient to justify late submissions:

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

Notifications regarding known technical problems with Grants.gov, if any, are posted at the top of the OJP funding web page at http://ojp.gov/funding/index.htm.

E. Application Review Information

Selection Criteria

1. Statement of the Problem (25 percent)

Provide Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) and/or population served data; describe the crime challenges of the jurisdiction. Identify the specific crime problem the jurisdiction seeks to address. Describe the process used to assess or determine the nature of the crime or type of crime problem. Applicants may also describe any existing partnerships with the academic/research community.

2. Project Design and Implementation (25 percent)

Describe project activities that are linked to meaningful and measurable outcomes. BJA expects agencies to obtain a Smart Prosecution result—a plausible, scientifically-based finding that their approach had an effect on the chronic crime problem and/or organizational effectiveness.

Describe specifically how the project will accomplish expected outcomes by providing the goals, objectives, and the performance measures applicable to the project. Include a comprehensive timeline (as an attachment) that identifies milestones, numerically lists deliverables, and who is responsible for each activity.

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the proposed research partner in the Smart Prosecution Initiative and how the research partner is integrated into the Smart Prosecution strategy. At a minimum, the research partner should: assist in problem description and definition; participate in solution development; provide ongoing analysis, monitoring, and assessment of the solution(s) impact; and prepare a final report that thoroughly assesses the results of the project.

Describe and provide evidence of the types and quality of data sources available to the agency to conduct appropriate analysis. For example:

- Does the agency have access to multiple sources of data (both internal and external to the agency) specific to the identified problem?
- o Does the agency have the ability to integrate data from different sources?

Describe the development of a prevention/mitigation strategy to address the problem.

3. Capabilities and Competencies (20 percent)

Fully describe the applicant's capabilities to implement the project and the competencies of the staff assigned to the project. In addition, describe and demonstrate crime and criminal intelligence analysis capacity. Describe previous prosecution activities that include research partners and report the results of those efforts.

Describe the level of agency executive support for the project, as well as the nature and extent of involvement of command staff in the project.

Describe the qualifications of the Smart Prosecution research partner and the prior experience of the researcher with "action research." Specifically, the application should describe their experience with such activities as:

- Developing logic models, collecting and analyzing criminal justice and public safety data, and using data to identify criminal justice and public safety related problems;
- Working collaboratively with criminal justice agencies to overcome barriers to research-driven problem solving, as well as identifying and proposing proven strategies/interventions to address problems;
- Documenting program operations and processes, assessing implementation fidelity, making recommendations for program improvement, and measuring program outcomes and using data to determine program effectiveness;
- Regularly presenting findings and conclusions both orally and in written form to prosecutors, developing "real-time" products and resources for strategic decisionmaking, and working with prosecutorial agencies to develop a sustainability plans; and
- Communicating with a wide variety of public sector, private, and community-based individuals.

4. Plan for Collecting the Data Required for this Solicitation's Performance Measures (15 percent)

Describe the process and methods for evaluating project performance. Identify who will collect the data, who is responsible for performance and outcome measurement, and how the information will be used to guide and evaluate the impact of the program. Describe the process to accurately report implementation findings.

5. Budget (10 percent)

Provide a proposed budget and budget narrative that are complete, cost effective, and allowable (e.g., reasonable, allowable, and necessary for project activities). Budget Narratives should 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.⁶

Applicants should budget travel/lodging expenses for four-person teams of agency and research partner representatives to attend three 2-day meetings during the 24-month project period, including the 2016 Smart Suite Conference. The meetings may be held in the Washington, D.C. area or other regions of the country.

Applicants should allocate at least 20 percent of the project budget to support the research and evaluation components of their initiative.

6. Sustainability Planning (5 percent)

Describe the plan for sustaining any innovations, crime reductions, organizational changes, research partnerships and other collaborations established or achieved during the project once the federal funding support ends,

Review Process

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

⁶ See generally 2 C.F.R. 200.300 (provides a general description of national policy requirements typically applicable to recipients of federal awards, including the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 [FFATA]).

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

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

For a list of critical elements, see "What an Application Should Include" under <u>Section D.</u> Application and Submission Information.

BJA may use internal peer reviewers, external peer reviewers, or a combination, to assess applications meeting basic minimum requirements on technical merit using the solicitation's selection criteria. An external peer reviewer is an expert in the subject matter of a given solicitation who is not a current DOJ employee. An internal reviewer is a current DOJ employee who is well-versed or has expertise in the subject matter of this solicitation. A peer review panel will evaluate, score, and rate applications that meet basic minimum requirements. Peer reviewers' ratings and any resulting recommendations are advisory only, although their views are considered carefully. In addition to peer review ratings, considerations for award recommendations and decisions may include, but are not limited to, underserved populations, geographic diversity, strategic priorities, past performance under prior BJA and OJP awards, and available funding.

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

- 1. Financial stability and fiscal integrity
- 2. Quality of management systems and ability to meet the management standards prescribed in the Financial Guide
- 3. History of performance
- 4. Reports and findings from audits
- 5. The applicant's ability to effectively implement statutory, regulatory, or other requirements imposed on award recipients.
- 6. Proposed costs to determine if the Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative accurately explain project costs, and whether those costs are reasonable, necessary, and allowable under applicable federal cost principles and agency regulations

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, peer review ratings, underserved populations, geographic diversity, strategic priorities, past performance under prior BJA and OJP awards, and available funding when making awards.

F. Federal Award Administration Information

Federal Award Notices

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

Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements

If selected for funding, in addition to implementing the funded project consistent with the agency-approved project proposal and budget, the recipient must comply with award terms and conditions, and other legal requirements, including but not limited to OMB, DOJ or other federal regulations which will be included in the award, incorporated into the award by reference, or are otherwise applicable to the award. OJP strongly encourages prospective applicants to review the information pertaining to these requirements **prior** to submitting an application. To assist applicants and recipients in accessing and reviewing this information, OJP has placed pertinent information on its <u>Solicitation Requirements</u> page of the <u>OJP Funding Resource Center</u>.

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

- <u>Certifications Regarding Lobbying: Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility</u>
 <u>Matters: and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements</u>
- Standard Assurances

Upon grant approval, OJP electronically transmits (via GMS) the award document to the prospective award recipient. In addition to other award information, the award document contains award terms and conditions that specify national policy requirements⁷ with which recipients of federal funding must comply; uniform administrative requirements, cost principles, and audit requirements; and program-specific terms and conditions required based on applicable program (statutory) authority or requirements set forth in OJP solicitations and program announcements, and other requirements which may be attached to appropriated funding. For example, certain efforts may call for special requirements, terms, or conditions relating to intellectual property, data/information-sharing or -access, or information security; or audit requirements, expenditures and milestones, or publications and/or press releases. OJP also may place additional terms and conditions on an award based on its risk assessment of the

⁷ See generally 2 C.F.R. 200.300 (provides a general description of national policy requirements typically applicable to recipients of federal awards, including the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 [FFATA]).

applicant, or for other reasons it determines necessary to fulfill the goals and objectives of the program.

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

General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements

Recipients must submit quarterly financial reports; semi-annual progress reports; final financial and progress reports; and, if applicable, an annual audit report in accordance with the Part 200 Uniform Requirements. Future awards and fund drawdowns may be withheld if reports are delinquent.

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

G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)

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

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

H. Other Information

Provide Feedback to OJP

To assist OJP in improving its application and award processes, we encourage applicants to provide feedback on this solicitation, the application submission process, and/or the application review/peer review process. Provide feedback to OJPSolicitationFeedback@usdoi.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 e-mail listed on the front of this solicitation document. These contacts are provided to help ensure that you can directly reach an individual who can address your specific questions in a timely manner.

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

Application Checklist FY 2015 Smart Prosecution Initiative

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

What an Applicant Should Do-

mat an Applicant Chould Do.
Prior to Registering in Grants.gov:
Acquire a DUNS Number (see page 21)
Acquire or renew registration with SAM (see page 21)
To Register with Grants.gov.
Acquire AOR and Grants.gov username/password (see page 21)
Acquire AOR confirmation from the E-Biz POC (see page 21)
To Find Funding Opportunity:
Search for the Funding Opportunity on Grants.gov (see page 21)
Download Funding Opportunity and Application Package
Sign up for Grants.gov email notifications (optional) (see page 20)
Read Important Notice: Applying for Grants in Grants.gov
Read OJP policy and guidance on conference approval, planning, and reporting
available at ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/PostawardRequirements/chapter3.10a.htm
After Application Submission, Receive Grants.gov Email Notifications That:
(1) application has been received,
(2) application has either been successfully validated or rejected with errors
(see page 21)
If No Grants.gov Receipt, and Validation or Error Notifications are Received:
contact the NCJRS Response Center regarding experiencing technical difficulties
(see page 22)
General Requirements:
Review the Solicitation Requirements in the OJP Funding Resource Center.
Scope Requirement:
The federal amount requested is within the allowable limit(s) of \$400,000.
Eligibility Requirement: Eligible applicants are limited to state, local, and tribal prosecutorial
agencies or a government agency or nonprofit organization as fiscal agent for the applicant.

What an Application Should Include:

 Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) (see page 11)
 Project Abstract (see page 12)
 Program Narrative (see page 12)
 Budget Detail Worksheet (see page 15)
 Budget Narrative (see page 15)
 Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable) (see page 15)
 Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable) (see page 16)
 Applicant Disclosure of High Risk Status (see page 16)
 Additional Attachments
Timeline (see page 17)
Letter of Support from the Chief Prosecutor (see page 17)
Résumés (see page 17)
Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications (see page 17)
Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity (see page 18)
 Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire (see page 19)
 Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL) (see page 19)
 Employee Compensation Waiver request and justification (if applicable) (see page 10)