

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
Bureau of Justice Assistance



The [U.S. Department of Justice](#) (DOJ), [Office of Justice Programs](#) (OJP), [Bureau of Justice Assistance](#) (BJA) is seeking applications for funding for the Second Chance Act Statewide Adult Recidivism Reduction Strategic Implementation Program. This program furthers the Department's mission by providing services and programs to help facilitate the successful reintegration of individuals returning from incarceration to their communities.

Second Chance Act Statewide Adult Recidivism Reduction Strategic Plan Implementation Program FY 2016 Competitive Grant Announcement Due August 30, 2016

Eligibility

Eligible applicants are limited to the seven state recipients of FY 2015 Statewide Recidivism Reduction Strategic Planning awards from BJA.

Deadline

Applicants must register in the [OJP Grants Management System \(GMS\)](#) prior to submitting an application for this funding opportunity. Registration is required for all applicants, even those previously registered in GMS. Select the "Apply Online" button associated with the solicitation title. All registrations and applications are **due 11:59 p.m. eastern time on August 30, 2016**.

For additional information, see [How to Apply](#) in [Section D: Application and Submission Information](#).

Contact Information

For technical assistance with submitting an application, contact the Grants Management System Support Hotline at 888-549-9901, option 3 or via email at GMS.HelpDesk@usdoj.gov. The [GMS](#) Support Hotline hours of operation are Monday – Friday from 6:00 a.m. to midnight eastern time, except federal holidays.

Applicants that experience unforeseen GMS technical issues beyond their control that prevent them from submitting their application by the deadline must email 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 GMS Technical Issues" in the [How to Apply](#) section.

For assistance with any other requirement of this solicitation, contact the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) Response Center: toll-free at 1-800-851-3420; 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.

Grants.gov number assigned to this announcement: BJA-2016-9198

Release date: August 16, 2016

Contents

A. Program Description	4
Overview	4
Program-Specific Information	4
Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables	4
Evidence-Based Programs or Practices	12
B. Federal Award Information	12
Type of Award	12
Financial Management and System of Internal Controls.....	13
Budget Information	13
Match Requirement.....	14
Pre-Agreement Cost (also known as Pre-award Cost) Approvals.....	15
Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver	15
Prior Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conference/Meeting/Training Costs	16
Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable).....	16
C. Eligibility Information	16
Limit on Number of Application Submissions.....	16
D. Application and Submission Information.....	17
What an Application Should Include	17
How to Apply	25
E. Application Review Information.....	27
Selection Criteria	27
Review Process	31
F. Federal Award Administration Information	32
Federal Award Notices	32
Administrative, National Policy, and other Legal Requirements.....	32
General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements	33
G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)	33
H. Other Information	33
Provide Feedback to OJP.....	33
Application Checklist	34
Appendix 1	36
Appendix 2.....	41

Second Chance Act Statewide Adult Recidivism Reduction Strategic Plan Implementation Program (CFDA #16.812)

A. Program Description

Overview

The Second Chance Act (Pub. L. 110-199) seeks a comprehensive response to the large number of incarcerated adults and juveniles who are released from prison, jail, and juvenile residential facilities and return to their communities. There are currently over 2.2 million individuals serving time in our federal and state prisons, and millions of people cycling through local jails every year. Ninety-five percent of those incarcerated today will eventually be released and will return to their communities. The Second Chance Act Programs are designed to help communities develop and implement comprehensive and collaborative strategies that address the challenges posed by reentry and recidivism reduction.

Program-Specific Information

The Second Chance Act Programs are designed to help communities develop and implement comprehensive and collaborative strategies that address the challenges posed by reentry and recidivism reduction. Developing a comprehensive approach for reducing recidivism is extremely challenging for even the most sophisticated correctional agency, requiring access to data, service delivery changes, and coordination from multiple systems. Therefore, a proposal should include non-traditional partnerships with community-based organization(s) that have specifically focused on providing reentry services that include holistic approaches that center on family-based services and family-based visitation.

This solicitation will provide funding for 12-month implementation grants, during which time members of a collaborative planning team will convene and work to implement the Statewide Recidivism Reduction Strategic Plan completed through the BJA funded FY 2015 Statewide Recidivism Reduction Strategic Planning grant. These plans must be data-driven, focused on system-level reforms related to: (1) risk- and need-driven case planning and resource allocation; 2) the delivery of quality programming targeting criminogenic needs; and (3) effective supervision practices. Plans must include strong evaluation and sustainability components. The selected grantees will serve as learning sites for implementing a comprehensive state-level recidivism reduction plan. Pending grantee performance and availability of future appropriations, two supplemental awards for additional 12-month periods are anticipated.

Funding is authorized under the Second Chance Act Demonstration Programs, 42 USC 3797w.

Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables

The goal of this program is for states to reduce their statewide recidivism rate. The objective of the program is to support effective strategies for reducing recidivism and enhancing public safety. Funded projects will:

- Focus on the individuals most likely to recidivate.
- Use risk and needs assessments to inform resource-allocation decisions and individual case responses.
- Establish and scale up evidence-based programs and practices that reduce recidivism and ensure they are implemented with fidelity.
- Implement community supervision policies and practices that promote successful reentry.

Some examples of supported strategies include systemwide, sustainable changes to policy and procedure, and investments in capacity-building activities, such as:

- Staff skill development,
- investing in case management or assessment tools, and
- targeted programming investments that address high-risk individuals' criminogenic and behavioral health needs.

Strategies supported by this grant funding must be informed by a data-driven assessment of the needs of the target population, drivers of recidivism in the state, and system limitations (including both policy barriers and resource gaps).

NOTE: See the National Reentry Resource Center for [Recidivism Reduction Checklists](#), which outline effective recidivism reduction strategies and can be used by state leaders to evaluate strengths and weaknesses in their reentry efforts.

Recidivism Definition

For purposes of this solicitation, recidivism can be defined in accordance with the definition utilized by the applicant agency. This definition must be clearly articulated in the application and evidence of an established historical baseline recidivism rate provided. The applicant agency must document the capacity to continue to collect and maintain relevant data to track the recidivism rate according to the definition provided during the length of the project period and beyond.

Mandatory Requirements

To be eligible to receive an award under this solicitation, applicants must demonstrate compliance with the following mandatory program components:

Second Chance Act Statutory Requirements

Section 101 of the Second Chance Act outlines the following mandatory requirements that must be included in an application to be eligible for funding for a comprehensive reentry program:

1. A reentry strategic plan that describes the jurisdiction's long-term reentry strategy, including measurable annual and 5-year performance outcomes, relating to the long-term goals of increasing public safety and reducing recidivism. The reentry strategic plan must reflect input from nonprofit organizations, as appropriate and available. One goal of the plan shall be a 50 percent reduction in the rate of recidivism over a 5-year period, and the plan must include performance measures to assess progress toward a 10 percent reduction in recidivism over 2 years.
2. A detailed reentry implementation schedule and sustainability plan for the program.
3. Documentation that reflects the establishment and ongoing engagement of a Reentry Task Force or Reentry Council composed of relevant state, tribal, territorial, or local leaders and representatives of relevant agencies, service providers, nonprofit organizations, and other key stakeholders.
4. The Task Force should examine ways to pool resources and funding streams and collect data and best practices in reentry from stakeholder agencies and organizations.

5. The Task Force and the strategic planning requirement above should provide a key opportunity for local policymakers to work together to identify and address local barriers to effective reentry, including barriers that are policy or procedural in nature. (See Mandatory Requirement 10 below.)
6. Discussion of the role of local governmental agencies, nonprofit organizations, Continuums of Care, state or local interagency councils on homelessness, and community stakeholders that will coordinate and collaborate during the planning and implementation of the reentry strategy. The applicant will provide certification of the involvement of such agencies and organizations. These partners and participants in the creation of the reentry strategy should include representatives from the fields of public safety, corrections, housing (including partnerships with public housing authorities), homeless services providers, health, education, substance abuse, children and families, victims' services, employment, and business.
7. Extensive evidence of collaboration with state and local government agencies overseeing health, mental health, housing, homeless services, child welfare, education, substance abuse, victims services, state child support, and employment services, and with local law enforcement agencies.
8. An extensive discussion of the role of state corrections departments, community corrections agencies, and local jail corrections systems in ensuring successful reentry in their communities. Applications must include letters of support from corrections officials responsible for facilities or individuals to be served through this project (see "What an Application Should Include," on page 17).
9. Documentation that reflects explicit support of the chief executive officer of the applicant state, unit of local government, territory, or Indian tribe and how this office will remain informed and connected to the activities of the project. (See "What an Application Should Include," on page 17.)
10. A description of the evidence-based methodology and outcome measures that will be used to evaluate the program and a discussion of how such measurements will provide a valid assessment of the impact of the program.

Research shows there are six fundamental strategies of evidence-based correctional practice that are widely accepted as efficacious in reducing future criminal behavior. These six strategies are outlined in Appendix 1: Second Chance Act Grantees: What You Need to Know to Ensure Your Program is Built on Principles of Effective Practice (see page 36).

11. A description of how the project could be scaled up or broadly replicated if demonstrated to be effective.
12. A plan for the analysis of the statutory, regulatory, rules-based, and practice-based hurdles to reintegration of returning prisoners into the community.

Note: This may be integrated into the strategic planning requirement and guided by the local task force discussed above.)

- a. BJA encourages applicants to review the database of the American Bar Association (ABA) National Study on the Collateral Consequences of Criminal Convictions, which catalogues statutes and administrative rules that contain a collateral consequence. The database, available at www.abacollateralconsequences.org/, will assist attorneys, policymakers, and

the public to more easily identify what consequences follow from particular criminal offenses and identify opportunities to reduce barriers to successful reentry.

Additional Mandatory Program Implementation Requirements

Successful applicants will engage in a comprehensive implementation process that will span a 12-month period and will be driven by the Statewide Recidivism Reduction Strategic Plan completed during the FY 2015 grant-funded process. This plan should clearly describe the policy and procedural changes, capacity-building activities, and programmatic investments the state will undertake to achieve their desired reduction in overall recidivism.

All applicants **MUST** demonstrate the state's commitment to undertake the following activities in the implementation process:

- In addition to the documentation of **explicit support provided from the state's chief executive** (see Mandatory Requirement #9 above), applications must include a **written letter of support** for the project from the state Commissioner/Director/Secretary of Corrections.
- Establish a collaborative implementation steering team to guide and oversee the implementation process. The team should include a representative cross section of state policymakers, agency directors and managers, community partners, and line staff that will be directly affected by the plan.
 - BJA recommends that this team be the same as, or builds upon, the planning team established during the FY 2015 Statewide Recidivism Reduction (SRR) planning grant process, although some changes in membership are to be expected.
- Develop a comprehensive implementation work plan, within the **first 4 months** of the implementation phase of the project, based on a planning and implementation (P&I) guide provided by BJA's technical assistance provider. The P&I guide must include:
 - A strategy to engage key stakeholders and educate them about the plan to promote buy-in.
 - An evaluation plan that details what data needs to be collected as the project is rolled out to ensure an evaluation can be completed (this should be included in the Statewide Recidivism Reduction Strategic Plan that your team completed during the FY 2015 SRR planning process, but you will want to revisit it with your evaluator and add in additional detail as needed).
 - Indicate what intermediate data will be tracked to monitor implementation progress, progress toward meeting state recidivism reduction goal, and how that information will be reported to key stakeholders.
 - An updated assessment of the characteristics of target population that will be affected by the plan to inform implementation.
 - An ongoing plan to review and change agency policies or procedures, and establish any MOUs or LOAs as needed in order to develop a sound organizational infrastructure to support the implementation of targeted interventions.

- An ongoing training, coaching, and supervision plan for staff implementing, supervising, or directly affected by any new programs or policies on how to implement those changes, and the importance of evidenced-based practices.
- An ongoing oversight/quality assurance process to ensure evidence-based practices supported by the grant are being implemented appropriately and a corresponding plan for how to respond to shortcomings or successes.
- A strategy for engaging executive, legislative, and judicial state policymakers throughout the grant period to promote broad political support for the project (this should be included in the Statewide Recidivism Reduction Strategic Plan that your team completed during the FY 2015 SRR planning process, but you will want to revisit it and add in additional detail as needed).
- Hire an experienced full-time Project Director to staff the implementation steering team and facilitate the development and execution of the implementation work plan.
- Build capacity with non-traditional community-based organizations that have specifically focused on providing reentry services for the target population and their families.
- Contract with a third-party evaluator at the beginning of the grant period to inform evaluation planning and conduct both a process and impact evaluation.
- Share data and work closely with BJA's technical assistance provider, the National Reentry Resource Center, coordinated by the Council of State Governments Justice Center, during the implementation phase.
- Describe what, if any, types of intensive technical assistance (which is available to grantees in addition to the funding support they receive) would be of particular value to the state during the implementation process

Allowable Uses of Award Funds

Following are optional, allowable uses of funds under this funding opportunity.

Staff and/or consultants. In addition to the required full-time Project Director, applicants may use the funds to support policy staff positions or consultants to advise on large-scale policy reforms and changes. These positions or consultants should have expertise in evidence-based practices and navigating via cross-systems reform efforts.

Use actuarial-based assessment instruments for reentry planning. Research shows that populations of individuals returning from incarceration should be assessed to determine criminogenic risk and needs factors, and determine supervision levels and services, so that appropriate interventions can be delivered. The use of assessment instruments that are reliable, validated, and normed for a specific population increase the chances that individuals will be matched with the appropriate type of treatment and reentry services.

- Applicants may use grant funds to invest in assessment tools, conduct a validation study of an existing tool, train staff or conduct quality assurance around the completion and use of assessment tools.

Target criminogenic needs that affect recidivism. While individuals reentering the community have a variety of treatment and behavioral needs, which are themselves risk factors for future offending, criminogenic needs are the dynamic risk factors mostly closely associated with offending behavior. Criminogenic risk and needs factors include a history of anti-social behavior; anti-social personality pattern; anti-social cognition; anti-social associates; family and/or marital; school and/or work; leisure and/or recreation; and substance abuse. Behavioral change is possible if individuals returning from incarceration are provided with tailored, sequential programming that addresses individual criminogenic needs that affect the risk of recidivism.

- Applicants may provide or contract for program interventions that target criminogenic risk factors, especially for higher-risk individuals. Any direct services funded through the grant should be tied to larger scale systems reforms and be sustainable (e.g. increasing treatment slots for a cognitive-behavioral program by adjusting workload for existing staff).

Promote the use of evidence-based programs and strategies by third-party service providers that provide substance abuse, mental health, and behavioral health treatment; aftercare; and reentry services. As agencies seek strategically and systematically to increase community-based services for individuals for whom such placement is safe and appropriate, it is vital to ensure that these services align with the principles of effective intervention, implement evidence-based principles with fidelity, meet the needs of the target populations, and achieve performance and outcome expectations. Accordingly, applicants may propose strategies that enable them to hold community-based services accountable for providing high-quality, effective services.

- Funds may be used to:
 - Assess and/or enhance the extent to which service providers are using validated risk and needs assessment tools, ensuring appropriate treatment or programming dosage and responsivity, and implementing evidence-based programs and strategies with fidelity.
 - Provide training in evidence-based practices to contracted service providers.
 - Plan for and implement a performance-based contracting system.

Provide sustained case planning/management from prison to the community. Reentry programs should ideally begin when the individual is first incarcerated and continue when the individual is released to the community. Since most individuals returning from incarceration are at the highest risk of re-arrest the first few months after release, services should be most intensive at the time of release to the community.

- Applicants are strongly urged to use consistent pre- and post- release case management and supervision that is sustained over a period of at least 6 months and is especially responsive to the individual's transition from incarceration to the community.

Enhance probation and paroling authorities' evidence-based policy, practice, and decisionmaking. Applicants may use grant funds to enhance parole decision-making in a comprehensive fashion, including the use of empirically based tools to assess individuals' risk and criminogenic needs, decisionmaking guidelines that provide structure and consistency to parole decisionmaking, training on evidence-based practices including engagement skills of parole board members, and collaborative partnerships with corrections and community supervision agencies and others to facilitate a safe transition to the community.

Implement intermediate and graduated responses, including swift and certain sanctions.

- Applicants may propose funding to:
 - Implement intermediate and graduated responses that may incorporate positive reinforcements and swift and certain sanctions, in one or more jurisdictions.

- Scale up existing pilots to take these initiatives to a greater number of jurisdictions or statewide.

Analyze and implement changes to policies and practices that guide community supervision conditions and revocation procedures.

- Applicants may use funds to work with judicial and prosecutorial counterparts to identify policies and practices in place that determine supervision conditions, incentives and sanctions, and revocation of supervision.
 - Applicants should consider basing supervision conditions on risk and criminogenic needs assessments and the use of a range of administrative sanction options.

Staff training. Implemented reentry programs should provide adequate staff training to appropriately use cognitive-behavioral interventions and strategies on the utilization of evidence-based programs and practices, including booster trainings and ongoing coaching.

Quality assurance. Based on comprehensive system and procedural change, applicants are encouraged to address quality assurance (QA). Implementation of QA can include tools from the field, trainings for staff involved in the QA process, developing audit measures, and incorporating QA into HR policies, practices, and staff performance evaluation.

Review and modify staffing policies. Applicants may use funds to review and update staff job descriptions, workload distribution, and performance evaluations to ensure they are aligned with and support the implementation of evidence-based practices.

- This may involve updating expectations for how staff interacts with clients, adjusting caseload sizes and contact standards to reflect different criminogenic risk levels, and modifying performance evaluations to promote compliance with evidence-based practices.

Data collection and information sharing capacity: Applicants may use funds to implement technology solutions and changes to policy that advance data collection, interagency information sharing, and performance measurement and evaluation.

These technology solutions should:

- Help improve and automate the flow of information between agencies to enhance reentry programming and rehabilitation and support an effective continuity of care for justice-involved individuals.
- Improve the ability to track aggregate performance measures related to recidivism and other important performance outcomes.

Applicants are strongly encouraged to develop methods for translating data to policymakers, administrators, staff, and service providers.

Process and Outcome Evaluation: Contract with a third-party evaluator to inform evaluation planning and conduct both a process and impact evaluation.

Resources for Civil Legal Aid. Civil legal assistance can often play a critical role in addressing barriers to successful reintegration. This guidance clarifies that an allowable use of Second Chance Act funds for reentry services includes referral to and payment of legal services related to the purpose of the grant, such as: securing a driver's license, expunging criminal records, litigating inappropriate denials of housing or employment and violations of the Fair Credit Reporting Act, creating and/or modifying child support orders, and other family law services that help stabilize individuals and families.

- This excludes the payment of fines or penalties associated with a driver's license suspension or the payment of child support. For more information, go to www.bja.gov/Programs/SecondChanceLegalServicesGuidance.pdf.

Access to Health Care. Applicants may plan and implement strategies for expanded Medicaid eligibility, behavioral health parity, connection to subsidized private health insurance options through the health insurance marketplace (also known as exchanges) to increase access, service use, and outcomes.

- Develop and implement strategies to identify and enroll eligible, uninsured program participants in Medicaid, or other insurance through health exchanges, and to connect them to treatment providers as appropriate.
- Plan and strategize for how expanded options for access to healthcare can enhance outcomes for individuals returning home from incarceration.

Target Population

The target population for the initiative should be based on documented groups of persons that significantly contribute to increased recidivism rates. Applicants should demonstrate that the target population is large enough such that reducing recidivism rates among this group will have an impact on the statewide recidivism rate.

Applicants **MUST** provide justification and support documentation for selecting the target population: e.g., size (if it is narrow and not statewide), specific geographic regions, or individuals on a specific type of supervision), demonstrating that these populations have disproportionately higher recidivism rates, and reducing their recidivism could impact the statewide rate (see the table below for an example of how to make this determination).

Also note that certain reforms put in place through this grant may impact the full state population, not just the target population. For example, the target population may be parolees, but training all institution-based case managers in motivational interviewing skills will likely have benefits for inmates regardless of their supervision status upon release. These types of systemwide reforms and investments are encouraged. A sample for how to demonstrate the target population and recidivism reduction targets relative to the entire reentry population follows:

	Target Population	Statewide
Annual releases from prison:	1,500	4,000
Current Recidivism Rate:	50%	30%
Total Recidivists:	750	1,200
Post-SRR Implementation Recidivism Rate:	40%	26%
Total Recidivists:	600	1,050
Recidivism Reduction Target:	150 fewer recidivists	150 fewer recidivists
Rate Reduction (%)	20%	12.5%

Applicant Resources

National Reentry Resource Center (NRRC)

BJA and OJJDP are also collaborating on the oversight of the [National Reentry Resource Center](#). The NRRC, funded by BJA, provides training and technical assistance to states, tribes, territories, local governments, service providers, nonprofit organizations, and correctional agencies and institutions working on reentry, including Second Chance Act grantees. The NRRC hosts a funding page that lists all reentry-related federal funding opportunities. All successful applicants will receive intensive technical assistance from the NRRC.

Evidence-Based Programs or Practices

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

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

Collaborative partnerships between researchers and practitioners have great potential to improve practice and policy. NIJ recently published findings of the Research-Practitioner Partnerships Study, which documents, synthesizes, and shares what makes partnerships between researchers and practitioners successful: "[Recommendations for Collaborating Successfully With Academic Researchers, Findings from the Researcher-Practitioner Partnerships Study \(RPPS\).](#)"

B. Federal Award Information

BJA estimates that it will make up to three awards of up to \$1,000,000 each, for an estimated total of \$3,000,000 for a period of 12 months. Pending grantee performance and availability of future appropriations, two supplements of \$1,000,000 each are anticipated.

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

Type of Award¹

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

¹ 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 entity²) 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 (and 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

Applicants must budget funds to travel to DOJ-sponsored grant meetings. Applicants should estimate the costs of travel and accommodations for three staff to attend two meetings in Washington, DC. All expenses must be reasonable, allowable, and necessary to the project.

Unallowable Uses for Award Funds

In addition to the unallowable costs identified in the [2015 DOJ Grants Financial Guide](#), award funds may not be used for the following:

- Prizes/rewards/entertainment/trinkets (or any type of monetary incentive)
- Client stipends
- Gift cards
- Vehicles
- Food and beverage

² For purposes of this solicitation, “pass-through entity” includes any entity eligible to receive funding as a recipient or subrecipient under this solicitation that, if funded, may make a subaward(s) to a subrecipient(s) to carry out part of the funded program.

For questions pertaining to budget and examples of allowable and unallowable costs, see the [2015 DOJ Grants Financial Guide](#).

Match Requirement

As required by the Second Chance Act, a match is required for all applications. Federal funds awarded under this program may not cover more than 50 percent of the total costs of the project being funded. Applicants must identify the source of the 50 percent non-federal portion of the total project costs and how they will use match funds. The recipient of a grant must provide a minimum of 25 percent of the total project cost in cash match, and 25 percent of the total project cost may be matched by making in-kind contributions of goods or services that are directly related to the purpose for which the grant was awarded. Federal funds received and cash match provided by the grantee shall be used to supplement, not supplant, non-federal funds that would otherwise be available for the activities funded under this section.

The applicant must identify the source of the 25 percent non-federal cash portion of the budget and how both cash and in-kind match funds will be used.

Match Waiver:

The Attorney General may waive the match requirement upon a determination of fiscal hardship. To be considered for a waiver of match, a letter of request signed by the Authorized Representative must be submitted with the application defining the fiscal hardship. Fiscal hardship may be defined in terms related to reductions in overall correctional budgets, furloughing or reductions in force of correctional staff or other similar documented actions which have resulted in severe budget reductions. **Detailed information must be provided with match waiver requests.**

A match waiver request must be submitted as a separate attachment to the application and titled as the "Match Waiver."

Note: The budget detail should distinguish cash from in-kind matched funds using an asterisk to show what percentage of the budget is cash. Once incorporated into the OJP-approved budget, the match becomes mandatory and subject to audit. Further, 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.

The formula for calculating match is:

$$\frac{\text{Federal Award Amount}}{\text{Federal Share Percentage}} = \text{Adjusted (Total) Project Costs}$$

Required Recipient's Share Percentage x Adjusted Project Cost = Required Match

Example: For a federal award amount of \$750,000, match would be calculated as follows:

$$\frac{\$750,000}{50\%} = \$1,500,000 \times 50\% = \$750,000 \text{ match}$$

Award Special Condition – Withholding of Funds for BJA Planning and Implementation Guide

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 receiving final approval of the project's budget from the Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO). The

recipient will not be authorized to obligate, expend, or draw down funds in excess of \$150,000 until BJA has reviewed and approved the action plan and a Grant Adjustment Notice has been issued and approved to remove the special condition. The action plan must include:

- A comprehensive project work plan based on a [Planning and Implementation \(P&I\) Guide](#) provided by BJA's technical assistance provider—the National Reentry Resource Center (NRRC)—which will guide each grantee in developing a strategic plan that incorporates evidence-based programs, policies, and practices. A completed P&I Guide will include:
 - Description of the problem and the data that led to its identification.
 - Logic model that identifies the solution(s) to be tested, intended outcomes, and evaluation metrics, including the research base for proposed strategies.
 - Evaluation plan, to include ongoing analysis, monitoring, and assessment of the overall project impact.
- A contract, memoranda of understanding, or other agreement that clearly delineates the role and responsibilities of the research partner. This document should establish the authority of the research partner to access agency data, interview personnel, and monitor operations that are relevant to the evaluation of the initiative.
- Letters of commitment from external agencies or organizations that are expected to participate in the project, to the extent that letters have not already been provided.
- Demonstrate executive support and commitment of agency resources to the project.

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 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 pre-agreement 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 [2015 DOJ Grants Financial Guide](#) 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.³ 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.

³ 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.

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 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 eligibility information, see title page.

For information on the 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 only the most recent system-validated version submitted. For more information on system-validated versions, see [How To Apply](#).

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: Abstract, Program Narrative, Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative, and the Assurance to collect and submit participant recidivism indicator data. 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.

Failure to submit the required information will result in an application being returned in the Grants Management System (GMS) for inclusion of the missing information OR the attachment of a withholding of funds special condition at the time of award.

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. The Grants Management System (GMS) takes information from the applicant’s profile to populate the fields on this form. The SF-424 should include the full amount requested for the entire project period.

Selecting the Appropriate Point of Contact (POC) and the Authorized Representative

Applicants should be cognizant that these two contacts should not be the same. The authorized representative must have the authority to enter the state, county, municipality, or other eligible unit of local government into a legal contract with the federal government. This person is typically a county commissioner, mayor, city manager, or other similarly designated official. The POC will serve as the primary point of contact and will be responsible for grant management duties such as the submission of reports. Make sure that the name, contact information, title, and salutation are correct.

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.
- **Clearly labeled, including the following information:**
 - legal name of the grant recipient and the title of the project;
 - funding category (state, locality, or tribe);
 - identify the research partner;
 - project’s purposes, goals, and deliverables;
 - program design elements, including the allowable uses of funds that will be incorporated into the project;
 - mandatory program components;
 - priority considerations
 - the projected number of participants to be serviced through the project and target population characteristics;
 - baseline recidivism rate; and
 - name of the validated risk assessment tool used.

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 promising applications submitted under this solicitation, but it may have the opportunity to share information with the public regarding promising but unfunded applications, for example, through a listing on a webpage available to the public. The intent of this public posting would be to allow other possible funders to become aware of such proposals.

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

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

3. Program Narrative

The program narrative must respond to the solicitation and the Selection Criteria (a-e) in the order given. The program narrative must be double-spaced, using a standard 12-point font (Times New Roman is preferred) with no less than 1-inch margins, and must not exceed 20 pages. Number pages “1 of 20,” “2 of 20,” 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 program narrative must respond to the solicitation and include sections a–e below, in order, as part of the program narrative. See “Selection Criteria” on page 27 for more information about what each section should include.

- 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 submit quarterly performance metrics through BJA's online Performance Measurement Tool (PMT), located at www.bjaperformancetools.org. Applicants should review the complete list of Second Chance Act Smart Reentry Program performance measures at: www.bjaperformancetools.org/help/scareentryquestionnaire.pdf.

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](http://www.ojp.gov/funding/Explore/SolicitationRequirements/EvidenceResearchEvaluationRequirements.htm) web page (www.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.

- e. Impact/Outcomes, Evaluation, and Sustainment.

4. Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative

a. Budget Detail Worksheet

A sample Budget Detail Worksheet can be found at www.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.

Applicants must show all computations. The budget detail worksheet should provide itemized break downs of all costs. If the computations do not show sufficient amount of detail or are incorrect, the budgets will be returned for corrections.

The budget summary page must reflect the amounts in the budget categories as included in the budget detail worksheet. These amounts should mirror the amounts in the budget narrative.

Applicants must budget funding to travel to DOJ-sponsored grant meetings. Applicants should estimate the costs of travel and accommodations for three staff to attend two meetings in Washington, DC. All expenses must be reasonable, allowable, and necessary to the project. The estimates must provide a breakdown of all costs and adhere to the federal per diem. At least 10 percent of the project budget must be allotted to the research partner.

For questions pertaining to budget and examples of allowable and unallowable costs, see the 2015 DOJ Grants Financial Guide at <http://ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/index.htm>.

See “Selection Criteria” on page 27 for more detail on what a budget for the Smart Reentry Program should include.

b. Budget Narrative

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

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

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

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

If an applicant proposes to make one or more non-competitive procurements of products or services, where the non-competitive procurement will exceed the simplified acquisition

threshold (also known as the small purchase threshold), which is currently set at \$150,000, the application should address the considerations outlined in the [2015 DOJ Grants Financial Guide](#).

d. Pre-Agreement Cost Approvals

For information on pre-agreement costs, see Section [B. Federal Award Information](#).

5. Assurance to Collect and Submit Recidivism Indicator Data

Applications must include an Assurance signed by the applicant organization's chief executive (see the Appendix 2 for the Assurance form) that all participant recidivism indicator data will be collected and submitted at the end of the grant period. Applications that do not include this Assurance will not be considered. Inability or refusal to submit data after award may impact the organization's ability to receive future BJA competitive grant funding.

6. 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 [2015 DOJ Grants Financial Guide](#). For assistance with identifying your cognizant agency, please contact the Customer Service Center at 1-800-458-0786 or at ask.ocfo@usdoj.gov. If DOJ is the cognizant federal agency, applicants may obtain information needed to submit an indirect cost rate proposal at <http://www.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.⁴

7. 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.

⁴ See 2 C.F.R. § 200.414(f).

Applicants unable to submit an application that includes a fully-executed (i.e., signed) copy of appropriate legal documentation, as described above, consistent with the applicable tribe's governance structure, should, at a minimum, submit an unsigned, draft version of such legal documentation as part of its application (except for cases in which, with respect to a tribal consortium applicant, consortium bylaws allow action without the support of all consortium member tribes). If selected for funding, BJA will make use of and access to funds contingent on receipt of the fully-executed legal documentation.

8. 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
- Reasons for the high risk status

OJP seeks this information to ensure appropriate federal oversight of any grant award. Unlike the Excluded Parties List, 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.

9. Additional Attachments

OJP strongly recommends that applicants use **appropriately descriptive filenames** (e.g., "Abstract," "Program Narrative," "Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative," "Timelines," "Memoranda of Understanding," "Disclosure of Pending Applications," and "Résumés") **for all attachments**. Also, OJP recommends that applicants include résumés in a single file. For better identification of application attachments during review, place the application number at the top of each application document.

- Letter from Applicant Agency Executive** demonstrating agency commitment to the project and to the research partnership. (Note also that the Executive must also sign the Assurance in Appendix 2 that aggregate recidivism indicator data will be submitted as required.)
- Letter from the Research Partner** demonstrating commitment to the project.
- Project Timeline** that includes each project goal, related objective activity, expected completion date, responsible person, or organization.
- Position Descriptions** for key positions and **Résumés** for personnel in those positions, including Research Partner position(s).
- Reentry Strategic Plan**
- Letters of Support/ Memoranda of Agreement (MOA)** from all key partners, detailing the commitment to work with reentry initiative partners to promote the mission of the project. The Letter of Support from the lead organization responsible for the operational aspects of

the project must include:

- (1) Certification that the lead agency has consulted with other local parties.
- (2) The following statement: “The agency agrees to provide individual criminal history information for all participants to evaluators, unless prohibited by law. These data will be provided in response to periodic requests from the grantees and evaluator throughout the period of performance of this project to capture both criminal history prior to the program enrollment and subsequent recidivism.”

g. Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications

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

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

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

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

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

Applicants should include the table as a separate attachment 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 worksheet in the application under this solicitation.”).

h. 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 sub-recipients) 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 sub-recipients) 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 sub-recipients 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 sub-recipients 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 be limited to, the adequacy of the applicant's efforts to identify factors that could affect the objectivity or integrity of the proposed staff and/or the organization in carrying out the research, development, or evaluation activity; and the adequacy of the applicant's existing or proposed remedies to control any such factors.

10. 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](#).

11. 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 submit applications through the [Grants Management System \(GMS\)](#), which provides support for the application, award, and management of awards at OJP. Applicants **must register in GMS for each specific funding opportunity**. Although the registration and submission deadlines are the same, OJP urges applicants to **register promptly**, especially if this is their first time using the system. Find complete instructions on how to register and submit an application in GMS at www.ojp.gov/gmscbt/. Applicants that experience technical difficulties during this process should email GMS.HelpDesk@usdoj.gov or call 888-549-9901 (option 3), Monday–Friday from 6:00 a.m. to midnight, Eastern Time, except federal holidays. OJP recommends that applicants **register immediately** to prevent delays in submitting an application package by the deadline.

Note on File Types: 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.”

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 GMS 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.

All applicants should complete the following steps:

- 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 application 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 that all applicants (other than individuals) for federal financial assistance maintain current registrations in the SAM database. 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.

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

- 3. Acquire a GMS username and password.** New users must create a GMS profile by selecting the “First Time User” link under the sign-in box of the [GMS](http://www.gms.gov) home page. For more information on how to register in GMS, go to www.ojp.gov/gmscbt.
- 4. Verify the SAM (formerly CCR) registration in GMS.** OJP requests that all applicants verify their SAM registration in GMS. Once logged into GMS, click the “CCR Claim” link on the left side of the default screen. Click the submit button to verify the SAM (formerly CCR) registration.
- 5. Search for the funding opportunity on GMS.** After logging into GMS or completing the GMS profile for username and password, go to the “Funding Opportunities” link on the left side of the page. Select BJA and the **FY 16 Second Chance Act Statewide Adult Recidivism Reduction Strategic Plan Implementation Program**.
- 6. Register by selecting the “Apply Online” button associated with the funding opportunity title.** The search results from step 5 will display the funding opportunity title along with the registration and application deadlines for this funding opportunity. Select the “Apply Online” button in the “Action” column to register for this funding opportunity and create an application in the system.

7. Follow the directions in GMS to submit an application consistent with this solicitation.

Once submitted, GMS will display a confirmation screen stating the submission was successful. **Important:** In some instances, applicants must wait for GMS approval before submitting an application. OJP urges applicants to submit the application **at least 72 hours prior** to the application due date.

Note: Duplicate Applications

If an applicant submits multiple versions of the same application, BJA will review only the most recent system-validated version submitted. See Note on “File Names and File Types” under [How to Apply](#).

Experiencing Unforeseen GMS Technical Issues

Applicants that experience unforeseen GMS technical issues beyond their control that prevent them from submitting their application by the deadline must contact the [GMS Help Desk](#) or the [SAM Help Desk](#) (Federal Service Desk) to report the technical issue and receive a tracking number. Then the applicant must email the BJA contact identified in the Contact Information section on page 2 of this solicitation **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 GMS Help Desk or SAM tracking number(s). **Note: BJA does not approve requests automatically.** After the program office reviews the submission and contacts the GMS Help Desk 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 GMS in sufficient time (SAM registration and renewal can take as long as 10 business days to complete)
- Failure to follow GMS instructions on how to register and apply as posted on the GMS website
- Failure to follow each instruction in the OJP solicitation

Technical issues with the applicant’s computer or information technology environment, including firewalls, browser incompatibility, etc.

E. Application Review Information

Selection Criteria

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

1. Statement of the Problem (15 percent)

- Describe the problems with reentry to the community.

- Indicate the jurisdiction or tribal community to be served and include details on the target population, the number of adults to be served and returning to the community, and describe the number and offense type for adults in facilities.
- Summarize the basic components of the current reentry process in the jurisdiction, including:
 - How risk and need assessments are currently utilized to develop individualized transition/reentry plans.
 - Data collection and analysis methodology.
- Provide justification and support documentation for selecting the target population.
 - Provide a baseline recidivism rate for the proposed target population and discuss what level of reduction in recidivism you would consider to be successful. If the applicant does not have a baseline recidivism rate for a historical sample of formerly incarcerated individuals **similar to the target population**, provide a rate for **another** population. For instance, use a recidivism rate for formerly incarcerated individuals that have been released from a local prison or jail, **such as a facility or a systemwide recidivism rate**. Make sure to include a description of the type of recidivism rate targeted such as arrest, conviction, revocation, and/or re-incarceration. Also, provide an explanation of the population (demographics, risk level, offense type) the follow-up period length (post-release), and the dates when the recidivism rate was calculated.

2. Project/Program Design and Implementation (35 percent)

- Describe how the Planning Phase activities will be addressed that include the completion of the *Planning and Implementation Guide*.
- Describe in detail how the proposed project addresses the Mandatory Second Chance Act Requirements specified on pages 5-7 and the Additional Mandatory Program Implementation Requirements on pages 7-8.
- Describe specifically which areas the proposed project will address (refer to the “Allowable Uses of Award Funds” section on pages 8-11).
- Use data to support the project design.
- Describe the roles and responsibilities of the research partner and how they are integrated into the applicant’s proposed strategy. At minimum, the research partner should assist with: a) finalization of strategic plan, b) data collection and analysis, c) finalizing the baseline recidivism rate, d) forecasting eligible program participant flow to ensure program utilization rates, and e) monitoring and evaluating performance; and preparing a final report that thoroughly assesses the results of the project.
- Provide a description of both the pre- **and** post-release services to be provided for every program participant.
- Describe the target population. Confirm with data that this target population was selected based on a data driven analysis of the drivers of the state’s recidivism rate.
- Indicate the number of people (reentrants) who would receive services over the length of the project period if this proposal is funded. If awarded funds, grantee performance will be measured against this number.

- If the applicant is requesting funds for a program that is currently operational, the applicant must state how many people the program has served (who meet the stated target population characteristics) over the past 6 months.
- If the applicant is proposing to implement a “new program,” the applicant must state how many people met the target population characteristics within the past 6 months.

3. Capabilities and Competencies (25 percent)

- Describe the management structure and staffing of the project, identifying the agency responsible for the project and the Project Director.
- Demonstrate the capability of the implementing agency and collaborative partners to implement the project effectively, including gathering and analyzing data, engaging and collaborating with partners, developing and implementing a plan and troubleshooting implementation problems, and working with research partners to evaluate a project. Describe and provide evidence of the types and quality of data sources available to the agency to conduct appropriate analysis.
- Describe the qualifications of the research partner and the prior experience of the researcher with “action research,” including prior work with corrections, probation or parole agencies and other criminal justice partners. Candidates should be experienced in several different data collection and analytic methods. It is preferable that they have several years of evaluation research experience. Specifically, the application should include the proposed research partner’s experience completing the following activities as a member of a task force or implementation team:
 - Developing a “theory of change”
 - Developing logic models
 - Collecting and analyzing criminal justice and public safety data
 - Using data to identify criminal justice and public safety related problems
 - Ability to work through barriers to research-driven problem solving
 - Identifying and proposing proven strategies/interventions to address problems
 - Documenting program operations and processes
 - Measuring program outcomes
 - Using data to determine program effectiveness
 - Assessing implementation fidelity
 - Regularly presenting findings and conclusions both orally and in written form to a task force/implementation team
 - Making recommendations for program improvement
 - Developing "real-time" products and resources for strategic decision-making
 - Working with the team to develop a sustainability plan
 - Communicating with a wide variety of public sector, private, and community individuals – for example, prosecutors, law enforcement leadership and line officers, community members, clergy representatives, funding agency representatives, legislators, city council members, and justice-involved are some of the individuals research partners may be called upon to present their evaluation findings, conclusions, and recommendations

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

- Describe the process for assessing the project’s effectiveness through the collection and reporting of the required performance metrics data (see “Performance Measures,” page 19), including who will be responsible and how data will be collected.

- List any additional performance metrics that will be used to assess the project's effectiveness and the process for collecting the information, including who will be responsible and how data will be collected.

5. Impact/Outcomes, Evaluation, Sustainability (10 percent)

- Identify goals and objectives for program development, implementation, and outcomes.
- Describe how performance will be documented, monitored, and evaluated, and identify the impact of the strategies once implemented. BJA expects that, with assistance from the research partner, grantees should be able to report timely, complete, and accurate data in the required grant reports.
- Describe the strategy/methodology for tracking participant unique identifiers, gaining access to recidivism data, and reporting this data to BJA.
- Describe the strategy/methodology for assessing the ability of the program to assess for participant risk level and criminogenic needs and to track that responsivity and dosage of services provided is individualized and attendant to the risk/needs of participants.
- Discuss how this effort will be integrated into the state and local justice system plans or commitments, how the program will be financially sustained after federal funding ends, and the expected long-term results for the program.

6. Budget (10 percent)

- Submit a budget that is complete, cost effective, and allowable (e.g., reasonable, allocable, and necessary for project activities). Budget narratives should generally demonstrate how applicants will maximize cost effectiveness of grant expenditures. Budget narratives should demonstrate cost effectiveness in relation to potential alternatives and the goals of the project.⁵
- Include an appropriate percent of the total grant award for research, data collection, performance measurement, and performance assessment. There is no minimum or maximum requirement regarding what constitutes an appropriate percent; however, the budget designated should be adequate to fund the activities outlined in the application. The Budget narrative should explain how the amount dedicated to these activities is adequate to support the proposed activities.
- The budget must indicate how the 50 percent federal funds and the 50 percent match will be allocated in the overall budget.
- Applicants must budget funding to travel to DOJ-sponsored grant meetings. Applicants should estimate the costs of travel and accommodations for three staff to attend two meetings in Washington, D.C., to include representatives from the corrections agency and the research partner.

⁵ 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.

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.

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 [Section D. 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 [2015 DOJ Grants 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 [Solicitation Requirements](#) page of the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#).

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.

- [Certifications Regarding Lobbying; Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters; and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements](#)
- [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 requirements⁶ 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

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]).

conditions on an award based on its risk assessment of the 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 title page.

For contact information for GMS, see 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@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 résumé to ojppeerreview@lmsolas.com. 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 2016 Second Chance Act Statewide Adult Recidivism Reduction Strategic Plan Implementation Program

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

What an Applicant Should Do:

Prior to Registering in GMS:

- _____ Acquire a DUNS Number (see page **Error! Bookmark not defined.**)
- _____ Acquire or renew registration with SAM (see page 26)

To Register with GMS:

- _____ For new users, acquire a GMS username and password* (see page 26)
- _____ For existing users, check GMS username and password* to ensure account access (see page 25)
- _____ Verify SAM registration in GMS (see page 26)
- _____ Search for correct funding opportunity in GMS (see page 26)
- _____ Select correct funding opportunity in GMS (see page 26)
- _____ Register by selecting the “Apply Online” button associated with the funding opportunity title (see page 26)
- _____ Read OJP policy and guidance on conference approval, planning, and reporting available at [Post Award Requirements](#) (see page 16)
- _____ If experiencing technical difficulties in GMS, contact the NCJRS Response Center (see page 27)

*Password Reset Notice – GMS users are reminded that while password reset capabilities exist, this function is only associated with points of contacts designated within GMS at the time the account was established. Neither OJP nor the GMS Help Desk will initiate a password reset unless requested by the authorized official or a designated point of contact associated with an award or application.

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 \$1,000,000.

Eligibility Requirement: Eligible applicants are limited to the seven state recipients of the FY15 Statewide Recidivism Reduction Planning awards from BJA.

What an Application Should Include:

- _____ Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) (see page 17)
- _____ Project Abstract (see page 17)
- _____ *Program Narrative (see page 18)
- _____ *Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative (see page 20)
- _____ Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable) (see page 21)

- _____ Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable) (see page 21)
- _____ Applicant Disclosure of High Risk Status (see page 22)
- _____ Additional Attachments
 - _____ Letter from Applicant Agency Executive (see page 22)
 - _____ Letter from Lead Agency (see page 22)
 - _____ Letter from Research Partner (see page 22)
 - _____ Project Timeline (see page 22)
 - _____ Position Descriptions and Résumés (see page 22)
 - _____ Letters of Support/ Memoranda of Agreement (see page 22)
 - _____ Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications (see page 23)
 - _____ Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity (see page 24)
- _____ Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire (see page 13)
- _____ Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL) (see page 25)
- _____ Employee Compensation Waiver request and justification (if applicable, see page 15)
- _____ *Assurance to Collect and Submit Recidivism Indicator Data (see page 21)

APPENDIX 1
Second Chance Act Grantees:
What You Need to Know to Ensure Your Program is Built on
Principles of Effective Practice

Fundamental Principles of Evidence-Based Correctional Practice

The primary objective of the Second Chance Act is to reduce recidivism. Based upon reliable research findings, there are six fundamental principles of evidence-based correctional practice that are widely accepted as strategies to reduce future criminal behavior.

- 1) Objectively Assess Criminogenic Risks and Needs:** Maintain a comprehensive system to establish risk screening and needs assessment. The actuarial assessment of justice-involved individuals—in a reliable and valid manner—is essential for the effective supervision and treatment of people returning from prisons, jails, and juvenile facilities (Andrews and Bonta, 2010). The levels of supervision and services for individuals must be matched to individual risk and need.
- 2) Enhance Intrinsic Motivation:** Staff must be able to relate to individuals in interpersonally sensitive and constructive ways in order to enhance intrinsic motivation. Research findings suggest that motivational interviewing or other cognitive-behavioral communication techniques can effectively enhance a person's desire to initiate and maintain behavior changes (Miller and Rollnick, 2002; Miller and Mount, 2001).
- 3) Target Higher-Risk Individuals:** Prioritize primary supervision and treatment resources for individuals who are at higher risk to re-offend. Consistent findings from a wide variety of recidivism studies show that supervision and treatment resources focused on lower-risk individuals produce little, if any, positive effect on the rates of subsequent criminal behavior (McGuire, 2001, 2002) and can at times increase the risk level of people in the low-risk categories. Maximum benefit is gained only when intervention resources are directed to moderate- and high-risk individuals.
- 4) Address Individuals' Greatest Criminogenic Needs.** The greatest emphasis must be placed on addressing those needs which are most closely associated with criminal behavior. When the factors that lead the individual to commit crimes are effectively addressed, that person is less likely to commit crime (Elliot, 2001).
- 5) Use Cognitive-Behavioral Interventions:** These strategies are focused on changing an individual's thinking patterns in order to change future behavior. The most effective interventions provide opportunities for participants to practice new behavior patterns and skills with feedback from program staff. (Andrews and Bonta, 2010)
- 6) Determine Dosage and Intensity of Services:** Higher-risk individuals require significantly more structure and services than lower-risk individuals. High-risk individuals should receive a minimum of 300 hours of cognitive-based interventions, moderate-risk individuals should receive a minimum of 200 hours, and low-risk individuals should receive a minimum of 100 hours of cognitive-based interventions. Additionally, during the initial 3 to 9 months post-release, 40 percent – 70 percent of high-risk individuals' free time needs to be occupied with delineated routine and appropriate services (Bourgon and Armstrong, 2006; Latessa, 2004; Gendreau and Goggin, 1995).

Important Considerations from the Research:

- Correctional staff members need to work with justice-involved persons to ensure they have the tools needed for success in the community.
- Correctional and community staff members must understand the importance of working with ***moderate- and high-risk*** individuals rather than low-risk individuals in order to demonstrate that their program can decrease recidivism.
- The most effective organizational-change strategies involve supervision and coaching of staff to reinforce the expected way of doing business—training alone is not sufficient.

Questions to Ask as You Launch Your Program:

- Who are you targeting for your program?
- Do the risk and needs of your target population match the services and supports you have funded through your Second Chance grant, or you are proposing to fund through your Second Chance grant application?
- When and how are the risks and needs of your target population assessed?
- Following the risk/need assessment, are the services, supervision, and interventions recommendations developed with the individual?
- Are these interventions based upon a systematic assessment of individual levels of risk and criminogenic needs?
- How are services coordinated for your target population as they move from the institutional phase, to the reentry phase, to the community phase?
- How is programming that is begun in prison linked to the programming that the individual receives in the community?
- How are supervision and treatment resources prioritized for moderate and high risk individuals?
- Are your interventions cognitive-behavioral based?
- Have staff members been trained to appropriately use cognitive-behavioral interventions and strategies?
- What data is collected about individuals reentering communities?
- Do you collect case-level data on which of your program participants have: (1) housing, (2) employment, (3) substance abuse treatment [if necessary], (4) mental health treatment [if necessary], and (5) social support?

References

- Andrews, D.A., and J. Bonta (2010). *The psychology of criminal conduct*, fifth edition. New Providence, NJ: Matthew Bender & Company, Inc.
- Blandford, Alex and Fred Osher. *Guidelines for the Successful Transition of People with Behavioral Health Disorders from Jail and Prison*. New York: Council of State Governments Justice Center, 2013. <http://csgjusticecenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/Guidelines-for-Successful-Transition.pdf>.
- Bourgon, G., and B. Armstrong (2006). Transferring the Principles of Effective Treatment into a “Real World” Setting. *Criminal Justice*, 32(1), 3-25.
- Carey, Mark. *Effective Case Management*. Silver Spring, MD: Center for Effective Public Policy, 2010.
- Carter, Madeline M. *The Importance of Data and Information in Achieving Successful Criminal Justice Outcomes*. Silver Spring, MD: Center for Effective Public Policy, 2006. <http://collaborativejustice.org/docs/Collaboration%20Data%20Monograph.pdf>.
- Carter, Madeline M. *Engaging in Collaborative Partnerships to Support Reentry*. Silver Spring, MD: Center for Effective Public Policy, 2010.
- Charlier, Jac and Maureen McDonnell. *Sustainability for Publicly-Funded Behavioral Health and Justice Grant Programs*. Delmar, NY: SAMHSA’s GAINS Center for Behavioral Health and Justice Transformation, 2012.
- The Council of State Governments Justice Center. *Reducing Recidivism: States Deliver Results*. New York: The Council of State Governments Justice Center, 2014. http://csgjusticecenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/ReducingRecidivism_StatesDeliverResults.pdf.
- Crime and Justice Institute at Community Resources for Justice. *Implementing Evidence-Based Policy and Practice in Community Corrections*, 2nd ed. Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections, 2009. <http://static.nicic.gov/Library/024107.pdf>.
- Cushman, Robert C. *Guidelines for Developing a Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections, 2002. <https://s3.amazonaws.com/static.nicic.gov/Library/017232.pdf>.
- Desmarais, Sarah L. and Jay P. Singh. *Risk Assessment Instruments Validated and Implemented in Correctional Settings in the United States*. New York: Council of State Governments Justice Center, 2013. <http://csgjusticecenter.org/reentry/publications/risk-assessment-instruments-validated-and-implemented-in-correctional-settings-in-the-united-states/>.
- Elliott, D. (2001). *Youth violence: A report of the Surgeon General*.
- Gendreau, P. and C. Goggin (1995). *Principles of effective correctional programming with offenders*. Center for Criminal Justice Studies and Department of Psychology, University of New Brunswick, New Jersey.
- Jones, Michael R. *Keeping Your Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee Going Strong*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections, 2013. <http://www.pretrial.org/download/pji-reports/Keeping%20Your%20CJCC%20Going%20Strong%20-%20Jones%202013.pdf>.

Joplin, Lore. Mapping the Criminal Justice System to Connect Justice-Involved Individuals with Treatment and Health Care under the Affordable Care Act. Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections, 2014. <https://s3.amazonaws.com/static.nicic.gov/Library/028222.pdf>.

Lampkin, Linda M. and Harry P. Hatry. *Key Steps in Outcome Management*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2003. <http://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/alfresco/publication-pdfs/310776-Key-Steps-in-Outcome-Management.PDF>.

Latessa, E.J. (2004). The challenge of change: Correctional programs and evidence based practices. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 3(4), 547-560.

McGuire, J. (2002). Evidence-based programming today. Paper presented International Community Corrections Association Conference, Boston, MA, November 2002.

McGuire, J. (2001). What works in correctional intervention? Evidence and practical implications. Pp. 25-43 in *Offender rehabilitation in practice: Implementing and evaluating effective programs*, edited by D.F. Gary Bernfeld, Alan Leschied. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, LTD.

Miller, W. and K.A. Mount (2001). "A small study of training in Motivational Interviewing: Does one workshop change clinician and client behavior?" Albuquerque, NM.

Miller, W. and S. Rollnick (2002). *Motivational Interviewing: Preparing people for change*. New York, NY: Guilford Press. BJA-2015-4110

Morley, Elain and Linda M. Lampkin. *Using Outcome Information: Making Data Pay Off*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2004. <http://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/alfresco/publication-pdfs/311040-Using-Outcome-Information.PDF>.

Rotter, Merrill and W. Amory Carr. *Reducing Criminal Recidivism for Justice-Involved Persons with Mental Illness: Risk/Needs/Responsivity and Cognitive-Behavioral Interventions*. Delmar, NY: SAMHSA's GAINS Center for Behavioral Health and Justice Transformation, 2013.

U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Department of Education, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, and U.S. Department of Labor. *What Works in Job Training: A Synthesis of the Evidence*. Washington, DC: 2014. <http://www.dol.gov/asp/evaluation/jdt/jdt.pdf>.

Andrews, D.A., and J. Bonta (2010). *The psychology of criminal conduct, fifth edition*. New Providence, NJ: Matthew Bender & Company, Inc.

Bourgon, G., and B. Armstrong (2006). Transferring the Principles of Effective Treatment into a "Real World" Setting. *Criminal Justice*, 32(1), 3-25.

Elliott, D. (2001). Youth violence: A report of the Surgeon General.

Gendreau, P. and C. Goggin (1995). Principles of effective correctional programming with offenders. Center for Criminal Justice Studies and Department of Psychology, University of New Brunswick, New Brunswick.

Latessa, E.J. (2004). The challenge of change: Correctional programs and evidence based practices. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 3(4), 547-560.

McGuire, J. (2002). Evidence-based programming today. Paper presented International Community Corrections Association Conference, Boston, MA, November 2002.

McGuire, J. (2001). What works in correctional intervention? Evidence and practical implications. Pp. 25-43 in *Offender rehabilitation in practice: Implementing and evaluating effective programs*, edited by D.F. Gary Bernfeld, Alan Leschied. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, LTD.

Miller, W. and K.A. Mount (2001). "A small study of training in Motivational Interviewing: Does one workshop change clinician and client behavior?" Albuquerque, NM.

Miller, W. and S. Rollnick (2002). *Motivational Interviewing: Preparing people for change*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

APPENDIX 2

Mandatory Chief Executive Assurance to Collect and Report Recidivism Indicator Data

I hereby assure that, if awarded grant funds under Second Chance Act **Statewide Adult Recidivism Reduction Strategic Plan Implementation**, my organization will collect unique identifiers and recidivism indicator performance data for each program participant, and will aggregate all such data and submit it via the Bureau of Justice Assistance Performance Measurement Tool as required upon grant closeout. I understand that the inability or refusal to submit such data after an award is made may impact my organization's ability to receive future Bureau of Justice Assistance competitive grant funding.

Signature

Title

Date